



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search


Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



600091605R







ST PAUL'S EPISTLE TO THE
GALATIANS.



ST PAUL'S EPISTLE TO THE
GALATIANS.

Cambridge:
PRINTED BY C. J. CLAY, M.A.
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

ST PAUL'S EPISTLE TO THE
GALATIANS:

WITH A CRITICAL AND GRAMMATICAL
COMMENTARY,
AND A REVISED TRANSLATION,


BY

CHARLES J. ELLICOTT D.D.
BISHOP OF GLOUCESTER AND BRISTOL.

THE THIRD EDITION, CAREFULLY REVISED THROUGHOUT.

LONDON:
LONGMAN, GREEN, LONGMAN, ROBERTS, & GREEN.
1863

100. ~~£.~~ 103.
107. *2s. 7d.*




ADVERTISEMENT TO THE THIRD EDITION.

THE present edition is in all respects nearly identical with the second. The quotations however, and references, especially to Scripture, have been carefully verified, and some slight improvements in typography introduced.

GLoucester,

August, 1863.



PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION.

THE present edition is but little different from the first in the results arrived at, and in the statement of the principles on which those results mainly rest; but in the details and construction of many of the notes it will be found to introduce changes both of diction and arrangement.

These changes have been found to be wholly unavoidable. The first edition was not only written with a scanty supply of books, and with a very limited knowledge of the contents of the Ancient Versions, but was constructed on principles which, though since found to be sound and trustworthy, do not appear in some cases to have been applied with sufficient ease and simplicity, or to have received a sufficiently extended range of application. It is useless to disguise the fact that what at first professed to be only purely critical and purely grammatical has by degrees become also exegetical; and has so far intruded into what is dogmatical, as to give systematic references to the leading treatises upon the points or subjects under discussion. The extremely kind reception that the different portions of this series have met with has led in two ways to these gradual alterations. On the one hand, the not unnatural desire to make each portion more worthy of the approval that had been extended towards

viii PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION.

its predecessor has been silently carrying me onward into widening fields of labour: on the other hand, the friendly criticisms that I have received from time to time have led me to retrench what has seemed unedifying, to dwell with somewhat less technicality of language on the peculiarities of grammar and construction, and yet at the same time to enter more fully upon all that has seemed to bring out the connexion of thought and sequence of argument.

The later portions of my work have been based on these somewhat remodelled principles, and—if I may trust the opinions of perhaps too partial and friendly judges—so far successfully, that I shall apparently be wise to keep them as the sort of standard to which, if God mercifully grant me life and strength, former portions of the series (wherever they may seem to need it) may be brought up, and future portions conformed.

The present edition then is an effort to make my earliest and decidedly most incomplete work as much as possible resemble those which apparently have some greater measures of maturity and completeness. It has involved, and I do not seek to disguise it, very great labour—labour, perhaps not very much less than writing a new commentary. For though the notes remain *substantially* what they were before, and though I have found no reason to retract former opinions except in about four or five debateable and contested passages¹, I have still found that the interpolation of new matter and the introduction of exegetical comments have obliged me in many cases to alter the arrangement of the whole note, and occasionally even to face the weary and irksome task of total re-writing and reconstruction. I rejoice however now

¹ These changes of opinion will be found noticed in their different places. I believe the only passages are, chap. ii. 6, προσανθέντο· iii. 4, ἐπάθετε· iii. 19, in part; iv. 17, ἐκκλείσαι· vi. 17, slightly, βαστάζω.

at length to feel that the reader of the later portions of this series will find no very appreciable difference when he turns back to this edition of the first portion. He will now no longer be without those invaluable guides, the Ancient Versions; he will, I trust, find but few links missing in the continuous illustration of the argument, scarcely any omission of a comment on important differences of reading, and on points of doctrinal difficulty no serious want of references to the best treatises and sermons of our great English divines. At the same time he will find the mode of interpretation and tenor of grammatical discussions precisely the same. Though the details may be often differently grouped, the principles are left wholly unchanged: and this, not from any undue predilection for former opinions, but simply from having found by somewhat severe testing and trial that they do appear to be sound and consistent.

For a notice of details it will be now sufficient to refer to the prefaces to earlier portions of this series, more especially to those prefixed to the third, fourth, and fifth volumes, in which the different component elements of the notes above alluded to will be found noticed and illustrated at some length. This only may be added, that particular care has been taken to adjust the various references, especially to such authorities of frequent occurrence as Winer's *Grammar of the New Testament*, to the paging of the latest edition¹.

¹ I have also retained the references to the translation of Neander's *Planting*, as published by Mr Bohn; and of Müller's *Doctrine of Sin*, as published by Messrs Clark; simply because the presence of these volumes in two justly popular series makes it probable that many readers may have these works, who have not, and perhaps may not be in the habit of consulting,

the originals. The translation of the latter of these works has, I believe, been somewhat severely criticized. I fear I am unable to defend it; but as the allusions to Müller in my notes relate more to general principles than to individual passages, I do not think the general reader will suffer much from the inaccuracies or harshness of the translation.

x PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION.

Where from inability to obtain access to the last edition of works previously quoted this has not been done, the reader will commonly find some allusion to the continued use of the authority in its earlier form.

I may also remark, that in deference to the wishes of some of my critics I have prefixed to the Epistle a few sentences of Introduction, giving a summary account of the results of recent historical criticism. This portion of sacred Literature has been so fully treated both by Dr Davidson and Dean Alford, and has further received so much valuable illustration from the excellent *Life of St Paul* by Messrs Conybeare and Howson, that I feel it now unnecessary to do more than to group together a few remarks for the benefit, not of the critical scholar, but of the general student, to whom these brief notices sometimes prove acceptable and suggestive.

I must not conclude without expressing my hearty sense of the value of several commentaries that have appeared since the publication of my first edition. I desire particularly to specify those of my friends, Dean Alford and Mr Bagge, and the thoughtful commentary of my kind correspondent, Dr Turner of New York. Of the great value of the first of these it is unnecessary for me to speak; my present notes will show how carefully I have considered the interpretations advanced in that excellent work, and how much I rejoice to observe that the results at which we arrive are not marked by many differences of opinion. The edition of Mr Bagge will be found very useful in critical details, in the careful and trustworthy references which it supplies to the older standard works of lexicography, and in what may be termed phraseological annotations. The third of these works differs so much from the present in its plan and general construction, as to make the points of contact between us much

fewer than I could wish ; but I may venture to express the opinion, that the reader who finds himself more interested in general interpretation than in scholastic detail will rarely consult the explanatory notes without profit and instruction. The recent edition of Professor Jowett has not been overlooked ; but after the careful and minute examination of his *Commentary on the Thessalonians* which I made last year, I have been reluctantly forced into the opinion that our systems of interpretation are so radically different, as to make a systematic reference to the works of this clever writer not so necessary as might have been the case if our views on momentous subjects had been more accordant and harmonious.

Before I draw these remarks to a close, I must not fail gratefully to return my heartfelt thanks for the numerous kind and important suggestions which I have received from private friends and from public criticism. By this aid I have been enabled to correct whatever has seemed doubtful or erroneous, and to these friendly comments the more perfect form in which this commentary now appears before the student is in many respects justly due. From my readers and those who are interested in these works I fear I must now claim some indulgence as to the future rate of my progress. While I may presume to offer to them the humble assurance that while life and health are spared to me the onward course of these volumes will not be suspended, I must not suppress the fact that the duties to which it has now pleased God to call me are such as must necessarily cause the appearance of future commentaries to take place at somewhat longer intervals. Those who are acquainted with studies of this nature will, I feel sure, agree with me that it is impossible to hurry such works ; nay more, I am convinced that all sober thinkers will concur in the opinion that there

xii PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION.

is no one thing for which a writer will have hereafter to answer before the dread tribunal of God with more terrible strictness than for having attempted to explain the everlasting Words of Life with haste and precipitation. When we consider only the errors and failures that mark every stage in our most deliberate and most matured progress even in merely secular subjects, we may well pause before we presume to hurry through the sanctuary of God with the dust and turmoil of worldly, self-seeking, and irreverent speed.

May the great Father of Lights look down with mercy on this effort to illustrate His word, and overrule it to His glory, His honour, and His praise.

CAMBRIDGE,

January 28, 1859.

PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION.

THE following commentary is the first part of an attempt to elucidate St Paul's Epistles by systematically applying to the Sacred Text the present principles of grammar and criticism.

It is the result of several years' devotion to the study of biblical Greek, and owes its existence to the conviction that in this country the present very advanced state of philology has scarcely been applied with sufficient rigour to the interpretation of the New Testament. Our popular commentaries are too exclusively *exegetical*¹, and presuppose in the ordinary student a greater knowledge of the peculiarities of the language of the New Testament than it is at all probable he possesses. Even the more promising student is sure to meet with two stumblingblocks in his path, when he first maturesly enters upon the study of the Holy Scriptures.

In the first place, the very systematic exactitude of his former discipline in classical Greek is calculated to mislead him in the study of writers who belonged to an age when change had impaired, and conquest had debased, the language in which they wrote: his exclusive attention to a single dialect, informed, for the most part, by a single and prevailing spirit, ill prepares him for the correct apprehension of writings in which the tinge of nationalities, and the admixture of

¹ I must explain the meaning in which I use this word when in contradistinction to *grammatical*. By a *grammatical* commentary, I mean one in which the principles of grammar are either exclusively or principally used to elucidate the meaning: by an *exegetical* commentary, one in which

other considerations, such as the circumstances or known sentiments of the writer, &c. are also taken into account. I am not quite sure that I am correct in thus limiting *exegetical*, but I know no other epithets that will serve to convey my meaning.

newer and deeper modes of thought are both distinctly recognizable : his familiarity with modes of expression which had arisen from the living wants of a living language ill prepares him correctly and completely to understand their force when they are reproduced by aliens in kindred and customs, and strangers, and even more than strangers, in tongue. Let all these diversities be fairly considered, and then, without entering into any more exact comparisons between biblical and classical Greek, it will be difficult not to admit that the advanced student in Attic Greek is liable to carry with him prejudices, which may, for a time at least, interfere with his full appreciation of the outward form in which the Sacred Oracles are enshrined. No better example of the general truth of these observations could be adduced than that of the illustrious Hermann, who, in his disquisition on the first three chapters of this very epistle, has convincingly shown, how even perceptions as accurate as his, and erudition as profound, may still signally fail when applied without previous exercise to the interpretation of the New Testament.

A second stumbling-block that the classical student invariably finds in his study of the New Testament is the deplorable state in which, till within the last few years, its grammar has been left. It is scarcely possible for any one unacquainted with the history and details of the grammar of the New Testament to form any conception of the aberrant and unnatural meanings that have been assigned to the prepositions and the particles, many of which cling to them in New Testament Lexicons to this very day¹. It requires a familiar acquaintance with the received glosses of several important passages to conceive the nature of the burdens hard to be borne, which long-suffering Hebraism—that hidden helper in all need, as Lücke² calls it—has had to sustain ; and how generations of excellent scholars have passed away without ever overcoming their Pharisaical reluctance to touch one of them with the tip of the finger. Then again grammatical figures have suffered every species of strain and distortion ; enallage, hendyadys, metonymy, have been urged with a freedom in the New Testament which would never have been tolerated in any classical author, however ill-cared

¹ That this language is in no way overstrained may be easily seen by the notices in Winer's *Grammar* on any leading preposition or conjunction. 'Ἐν is a difficult preposition in the N. T., but it would require a con-

siderable amount of argument to make us believe it could ever, even in Heb. xiii. 9, bear the meaning of *ex!* See Winer, *Gr.* § 48. a, p. 348.

² Lücke, *on John* iii. 20, Vol. III. p. 241.

for, and however obscure. Here and there in past days a few protesting voices were raised against the uncritical nature of the current interpretations; but it was not, in Germany, till within a very few years, till the days of Fritzsche and Winer, that they have met with any response or recognition; and among ourselves, even now they have secured only a limited and critical audience.

It thus only too often happens that when a young man enters for the first time seriously upon the study of the New Testament, it is with such an irrepressible feeling of repugnance to that laxity of language which he is led to believe is its prevailing characteristic, that he either loses for the language of inspiration that reverence which its mere literary merits alone may justly claim; or else, under the action of a better though mistaken feeling, he shrinks from applying to it that healthy criticism to which all his previous education had inured his mind. The more difficult the portion of Scripture, the more sensibly are these evils felt and recognized.

It is under these feelings that I have undertaken a commentary on St Paul's Epistles, which, by confining itself to the humbler and less ambitious sphere of grammatical details, may give the student some insight into the language of the New Testament, and enable him with more assured steps to ascend the difficult heights of exegetical and dogmatical theology. My own studies have irresistibly impelled me to the conviction that, without making any unnecessary distinctions between grammar and exegesis, we are still bound to recognize the necessity, *first*, of endeavouring to find out what the words actually convey, according to the ordinary rules of language; then, *secondly*, of observing the peculiar shade of meaning that the context appears to impart. Too often this process has been reversed; the commentator, on the strength of some *received interpretation* or some dogmatical bias, has stated what the passage ought to mean, and then has been tempted by the force of bad example to coerce the words *per Hebraismum*, or *per enallagen*, to yield the required sense. This in many, nay, most cases, I feel certain, has been done to a great degree *unconsciously*, yet still the evil effects remain. God's word, though innocently, has been dealt with deceitfully; and God's word, like His Ark of the Covenant, may not with impunity be stayed up by the officiousness of mortal aid.

I have then in all cases striven humbly and reverently to elicit from the words their simple and primary meaning.

Where that has *seemed* at variance with historical or dogmatical deductions,—where, in fact, exegesis has seemed to range itself on one side, grammar on the other,—I have never failed candidly to state it; where it has confirmed some time-honoured interpretation, I have joyfully and emphatically cast my small mite into the great treasury of sacred exegesis, and have felt gladdened at being able to yield some passing support to wiser and better men than myself¹. This however I would fain strive to impress upon my reader, to whatever party of the Church (alas! that there should be parties) he may chance to belong, that, as God is my witness, I have striven to state, in perfect candour and singleness of heart, all the details of interpretation with which I have come in contact. I have sought to support no particular party, I have desired to yield countenance to no peculiar views. I will candidly avow that on all the fundamental points of Christian faith and doctrine my mind is fully made up. It is not for me to sit in judgment upon what is called the liberal spirit of the age, but, without evoking controversies into which I have neither the will nor the ability to enter, I may be permitted to say, that upon the momentous subject of the inspiration of Scripture I cannot be so untrue to my own deepest convictions, or so forgetful of my anxious thoughts and investigations, as to affect a freedom of opinion which I am very far from entertaining. I deeply feel for those whom earth-born mist and vapour still hinder from beholding the full brightness and effulgence of divine truth; I entertain the most lively pity for those who still feel that the fresh fountains of Scripture are, in all the bitterness of the prophet's lamentation, only *waters that fail*;—I feel it and entertain it, and I trust that no ungentle word of mine may induce them to cling more tenaciously to their mournful convictions, yet still I am bound to say, to prevent the nature of my candour being misunderstood, that throughout this com-

¹ Amidst all these details I have, I trust, never forgotten that there is something higher than mere critical acumen, something more sure than grammatical exactitude; something which the world calls the *theological sense*, but which more devout thinkers recognize as the assisting grace of the Eternal Spirit of God. Without this, without also a deeper and more mysterious sympathy with the mind of the sacred writer whom we are presuming

to interpret, no mere verbal discussions can ever tend truly to elucidate, no investigation thoroughly to satisfy. I trust indeed that I have never been permitted to forget these golden words of him whom of all commentators I most honour and revere: οὐδὲ γὰρ δέ τὰ φήματα γυμνὰ ἔξερδειν, ἐπεὶ πολλὰ ἔγειραι τὰ ἀποφήματα· οὐδὲ τὴν λέξιν καθ' ἑαυτὴν βασανίζειν, ἀλλὰ τῇ διανοίᾳ προσέχειν τοῦ γράφοντος. Chrysost. tom. x. p. 675 B (ed. Bened.).

mentary the full¹ inspiration of Scripture has been felt as one of those strong subjective convictions to which every hour of meditation adds fresh strength and assurance. Yet I have never sought to mask or disguise a difficulty: I have never advanced an explanation of the truth of which I do not, myself at least, feel convinced. I should shrink from being so untrue to myself, I should tremble at being so presumptuous towards God; as if He who sent *the dream* may not in His own good time send *the interpretation thereof*. That there are difficulties in Scripture, that there are difficulties in this deep Epistle, I both know and feel, and I have in no case shrunk from pointing them out; but I also know that there is a time—whether in this world of unrest, or in that rest which remaineth to God's people, I know not—when every difficulty will be cleared up, every doubt dispersed: and it is this conviction that has supported me, when I have felt, and have been forced to record my conviction, that there are passages where the world's wisdom has not yet clearly seen into the depth of the deep things of God.

Before I wholly leave this momentous subject, I would fain plead its importance in regard to the method of interpretation which I have endeavoured to follow. I am well aware that the current of popular opinion is now steadily setting against grammatical details and investigations. It is thought, I believe, that a freer admixture of history, broader generalizations, and more suggestive reflections, may enable the student to catch the spirit of his author, and be borne serenely along without the weed and toil of ordinary travel. Upon the soundness of such theories in a general point of view I will not venture to pronounce an opinion; I am not an Athanase, and cannot confront a world; but in the particular sphere of Holy Scripture I may perhaps be permitted to say, that if we would train our younger students to be reverential thinkers, earnest Christians, and sound divines, we must habituate them to a patient and thoughtful study of the words and language of Scripture, before we allow them to indulge in an exegesis for which they are immature and incompetent. If the Scriptures are divinely inspired, then surely it is a young man's noblest occupation patiently and lovingly to note every change of expression, every turn of

¹ I avoid using any party expressions. I would not wish, on the one hand, to class myself with such thinkers as Calovius, nor could I subscribe to the *Formula Consensus Helvetici*: but

I am far indeed from recognizing that admixture of human imperfection and even error, which the popular theosophy of the day now finds in the Holy Scriptures.

xviii PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION.

language, every variety of inflexion, to analyze and to investigate, to contrast and to compare, until he has obtained some accurate knowledge of those outward elements which are permeated by the inward influence and powers of the Holy Spirit of God. As he wearisomely traces out the subtle distinctions that underlie some illative particle, or characterize some doubtful preposition, let him cheer himself with the reflection that every effort of thought he is thus enabled to make, is (with God's blessing) a step towards the inner shrine, a nearer approach to a recognition of the thoughts of an Apostle, yea, a less dim perception of the mind of Christ.

No one who feels deeply upon the subject of inspiration will allow himself to be beguiled into an indifference to the mysterious interest that attaches itself to the very grammar of the New Testament.

I will then plead no excuse that I have made my notes so exclusively critical and grammatical. I rejoice rather that the awakening and awakened interest for theology in this country is likely to afford me a plea and a justification for confining myself to a single province of sacred literature. Already, I believe, theologians are coming to the opinion that the time for compiled commentaries is passing away. Our resources are now too abundant for the various details of criticism, lexicography, grammar, exegesis, history, archæology, and doctrine, to be happily or harmoniously blended in one mass. One mind is scarcely sufficiently comprehensive to grasp properly these various subjects; one judgment is scarcely sufficiently discriminating to arrive at just conclusions on so many topics. The sagacious critic, the laborious lexicographer, the patient grammarian, the profound exegete, the suggestive historian, and the impartial theologian, are in the present state of biblical science never likely to be united in one person. Excellence in any one department is now difficult, in all, impossible. I trust then that the time is coming when theologians will carry out, especially in the New Testament, the principle of the division of labour, and, selecting that sphere of industry for which they are more particularly qualified, will in others be content to accept the results arrived at by the labours of their contemporaries¹.

¹ In the present Epistle there are distinct and instructive instances of the application of this principle. Hiltgenfeld has published a recent edition of the Epistle to the Galatians, in

which distinct prominence is given to historical and chronological investigations. Dr Brown has lately devoted some expository discourses nearly exclusively to the doctrine and practical

The most neglected portion of the New Testament literature is its lexicography, and this is the more inexcusable, as the excellent concordance of Bruder has been now twelve years before the world. I have here suffered greatly from want of sound help, and in addition to having frequently to draw solely from my own scanty resources in this department, and to leave my own more immediate subject to discuss points which I should have gladly found done to my hand, I have also had the thankless task of perpetually putting my readers on their guard against the overhasty and inaccurate classifications of Bretschneider and others. I have generally found Bretschneider's Lexicon the best; but the pages of my commentary will abundantly show how little reliance I have been able to place upon him. I rejoice to say that Dr Scott, master of Balliol College, is engaged on a Lexicon to the New Testament; and those who know his eminent qualifications for the task must feel, as I do, the most perfect confidence in the way in which it will be executed. I regret that it was too little advanced to be of any use to me in this commentary. The general lexicon (beside that of Stephens) which I have chiefly used is the edition of Passow's Lexicon by Palm and Rost, which I cannot help thinking is by very far the best lexicon in a moderate compass that we at present possess. The prepositions, in particular, are treated remarkably well, and very comprehensively.

The synonyms of the Greek Testament, a *most important* subject, have been greatly neglected. We have now a genial little volume from one who always writes felicitously and attractively upon such subjects; but the agreeable author will not I am sure be offended when I say, that it can scarcely be deemed otherwise than, as he himself modestly terms it, a slight contribution to the subject. We may fairly trust that an author who has begun so well will continue his labours in a more extended and comprehensive form. As Mr Trench's work came too late into my hands, I have principally used the imperfect work of Tittman; but I perfectly agree with Mr Trench in his estimate of its merits.

In the Grammar of the New Testament we are now in a fairly promising state. The very admirable work of Winer

teaching of the Epistle, while Mr Veitch has supplied him with grammatical annotations. Both of these works have their demerits as well as their merits, but at any rate they

show that their authors had the good sense to confine themselves to those departments of interpretation for which they felt the greatest aptitude.

xx PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION.

has completely rehabilitated the subject. It is a volume that I have studied with the closest attention, and to which I am under profound obligations. Still it would not be candid if I did not admit that it has its weak points. I do not consider the treatment of the particles (a most important subject in St Paul's epistles) at all equal to that of the prepositions, or by any means commensurate with our wants on this portion of grammar: the cases also might perhaps be more successfully handled. The great fault of the book is its superabundance of reference to the notes and commentaries on classical authors. In many cases these are of high importance; but in a vast quantity of others, as I have often found to my cost, but little information is to be derived from the source to which the reader is referred. Mr Green's *Grammar* I consider a work of great ability, but too short and unsystematic to be of the use it might otherwise have been to the student. I have therefore been obliged to use freely other grammatical subsidies than those which more particularly bear upon the New Testament¹. My object has been throughout to make my references more to grammars and professed repertoires of similar information, than to notes or commentaries on classical authors; for I am convinced that a *good* reference to a good grammar, though not a very showy evidence of research, is a truly valuable assistance; while a discursive note in an edition of a classic, from its want of context, frequently supplies little real information. I have allowed myself greater latitude in references to the notes of commentators on the New Testament, for here the similarity of language, and frequently of subject, constitutes a closer bond of union. In particular, I have used Fritzsche's edition of the Romans nearly as a grammar, so full is it and so elaborate in all details of language. As a grammarian I entertain for him the highest respect; but I confess my sympathy with him as a theologian is not great, nor can I do otherwise than deplore the unjust levity with which he often treats the Greek fathers, and the tone of bitterness and asperity which he

¹ I have especially used the admirable and (in my opinion) wholly unrivalled syntax of Bernhardy, the good compendious syntax of Madvig, the somewhat heavy treatise on the same subject by Scheuerlein, Jelf's *Grammar*, and the small Greek grammar by Dr Donaldson, which, though unpretending in form and succinct in its nature, will never be consulted even

by the advanced student without the greatest advantage. On the particles I have principally used the somewhat clumsy though useful work of Hartung, and the very able and voluminous notes of Klotz on *Devarius*. This latter work the student will rarely consult in vain. I have also derived some assistance from Thiersch's very good dissertation on the *Pentateuch*.

assumes towards the learned and pious Tholuck. It is a sad evidence of an untouched heart and unchastened spirit, when a commentator on the New Testament leaves the written traces of his bitterness on the margins of the Covenant of Love.

The same principle that has induced me to refer to repertories and systematic treatises on grammar has also influenced me whenever I have been led into dogmatical questions. I have sought in most cases information from writers who have made the whole subject their study. I have freely used Bishop Bull's *Harmonia Apostolica*, Waterland's Works, and such other of our great English divines as I have the good fortune to be acquainted with. I have used with profit the recent and popular treatise on St Paul's doctrine by Usteri, and that by Neander in his *Planting of Christianity*; both of which, with perhaps some reservations, may be recommended to the student. I regret that I cannot speak with so much freedom of the discussions of the clever and critical Ferdinand Baur in his *Apostel Paulus*. I have referred to him in a few cases, for his unquestionable ability has seemed to demand it, but it has been always cautiously and warily; nor do I at all wish to commend him to the notice of any student except of advanced knowledge and of fully fixed principles. The other books and authorities which I have cited will sufficiently speak for themselves.

I desire briefly, in conclusion, to allude to the general principles which I have adopted in the construction of the text, the compilation of the notes, and the revision of the translation, and to record my many obligations.

I. The text is substantially that of Tischendorf¹: the only deviations from it that I have felt compelled to make form the subject of the critical notes which are at intervals appended to the text. Changes have been made in punctuation; but these, generally speaking, have not been such as to require special notice. I have here applied the principle of division of labour which I venture to advocate. It has always seemed to me that it is at least a very hazardous, if

¹ It was long with me a subject of anxious thought whether I should adopt the text of Lachmann (for whose critical abilities I have a profound respect) or that of Tischendorf. The latter I consider inferior to Lachmann in talent, scholarship, and critical acumen. But as a palæographer he stands infinitely higher, as a man

of energy and industry he is unrivalled, and as a critic he has learnt from what he has suffered. Moreover he is with us, still learning, still gathering, still toiling; while Lachmann's edition, with all its excellencies and all its imperfections, must now remain as he has left it to us.

not a presumptuous undertaking, for any man, however good a scholar, to construct an original text without eminent qualifications for that task. Years of patient labour must have been devoted to those studies: an unflagging industry in collecting, and a persistent sagacity in sifting evidence must be united in the Biblical critic, or his labours will be worse than useless. Those who have not these advantages will do well to rely upon others, reserving however to themselves (if they are honest men and independent thinkers) the task of scrutinizing, testing, and, if need be, of expressing dissent from the results arrived at by those whom they follow. I have humbly endeavoured thus to act with regard to the text of the present epistle: where there has seemed reason to depart from Tischendorf (and he is *far from infallible*) I have done so, and have in all cases acted on fixed principles which time, and above all failures, have taught me. For a novice like myself to obtrude my critical canons on the reader would be only so much aimless presumption. I will only say that I can by no means assent to a blind adherence to external evidence, especially where the preponderance is not marked, and the internal evidence of importance: still, on the other hand, I regard with the greatest jealousy and suspicion any opposition to the nearly coincident testimony of the uncial MSS. unless the internal evidence be of a most strong and decisive character. I have always endeavoured, first, to ascertain the exact nature of the diplomatic evidence; secondly, that of what I have termed *paradiplomatic* arguments (I must apologize for coining the word), by which I mean the apparent probabilities of erroneous transcription, permutation of letters, itacism, and so forth; thirdly and lastly, the internal evidence, whether resting on apparent deviations from the *usus scribendi* of the sacred author, or the *propensio*, be it *critica*, *dogmatica*, or *epegetica*, on the part of the copyist. I have also endeavoured to make the critical notes as perspicuous as the nature of the subject will permit, by grouping the separate classes of authorities, uncial manuscripts (MSS.), cursive manuscripts (mss.), versions (Vv.), and Fathers (Ff.) Greek and Latin, and in some measure familiarizing the uneducated eye to comprehend these perplexing, yet deeply interesting particulars. The symbols I have used are either those of Tischendorf (to whose cheap and useful edition I refer the reader), or else self-explanatory. I cannot leave this part of the subject without earnestly advising the younger student to acquire, at least in outline, a knowledge of the history and details of sacred criticism, and

I can recommend him no better general instructor than Dr Davidson, in the second volume of his excellent treatise on Biblical criticism.

II. With regard to the notes, I would wish first to remark that they neither are nor pretend to be original. I have consulted all the best modern, and, I believe, the best ancient authorities, wherever they seemed likely to avail me in the line of interpretation I had marked out to myself. But as I have endeavoured to confine myself principally to critical and grammatical details, numerous authors of high position and merit in other provinces of interpretation have unavoidably been, though not unconsulted, still not generally cited. Hence, though I entertain a deep reverence for the exegetical abilities of some of the Latin Fathers, I have never been able to place that reliance on their scholarship which I thankfully and admiringly recognize in the great Greek commentators. Many of our popular English expositors I have been obliged from the same reasons to pass over; for to quote an author merely to find fault with him is a process with which I have no sympathy. I have studied to make my citations *in malam partem* on a fixed principle. In the first place, I hope I have always done it with that quick sense of my own weakness, imperfection, and errors, that is the strongest incentive to charitable judgments; and with that gentleness which befits a commentator on one whose affections were among the warmest and deepest that ever dwelt in mortal breast. In the second place, I have, I trust, rarely done it except where the contrast seemed more distinctly to show out what I conceived to be the true interpretation; where in fact the shadow was needed to enhance the light. Thirdly, I have sometimes felt that the allegiance I owe to Divine Truth, and the profound reverence I entertain for the very letter of Scripture, have required me to raise my voice, feeble as it is, against mischievous interpretations and rash criticism. The more pleasant duty of quoting *in bonam partem* has also been regulated by a system; first and foremost, of endeavouring to give to every man his due; secondly, of supporting myself by the judgments and wisdom of others. I have however in no case sought to construct those catenæ of names, which it seems now the fashion of commentators¹ to link together in assent or dissent; for whenever I have examined one in detail, I have invariably found that the authors thus huddled together often introduced such

¹ I regret to find that Professor Eadie, in his learned and laborious commentary on the Ephesians, has adopted this method; in some cases, e.g. p. 15, his authorities occupy five full lines of the commentary.

xxiv PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION.

countervailing statements as made their collective opinion anything but unanimous. This easy display of erudition,—and of error,—cannot be too much reprobated.

The portions upon which I have most dwelt are the particles, the cases, the prepositions, and, as far as I have been able, the compound verbs; but on this latter subject I have keenly felt the want of help, and have abundantly regretted that Winer has never completed the work he projected. If in the discussions on the particles I may have seemed wearisome or hypercritical, let me crave the reader's indulgence, and remind him of the excessive difficulties that have ever been felt and acknowledged in the connexion of thought in St Paul's Epistles. I hope no one will think my pains have here been misplaced. That my notes have visibly overlaid my text will, I fear, be urged against me. This I could have avoided by a more crowded page, or by disuniting the text and the notes; but I prefer bearing the charge to perplexing the reader's eye with close typography, or distracting his attention by references to an isolated text. The notes have been pared down in some cases to the very verge of obscurity; but in so difficult an epistle, after all possible curtailing, they must still be in disproportion to the text.

III. The last portion I have to notice is the translation. This it seemed desirable to append, as a brief but comprehensive summary of the interpretations advanced in the notes. The profound respect I entertain for our own noble version would have prevented me, as it did Hammond, from attempting any performance of this nature, if I had not seen that a few corrections made on a fixed principle would enable the Authorized Version adequately to reflect the most advanced state of modern scholarship. The Authorized Version has this incalculable advantage, that it is a truly *literal* translation,—the only form of translation that can properly and reverently be adopted in the case of the Holy Scriptures. Of the two other forms of translation, the idiomatic and the paraphrastic, I fully agree with Mr Kennedy (*Preface to Transl. of Demosth.*) in the opinion that the former is most suitable for the general run of classical authors; while the latter may possibly be useful in some philosophical or political treatises, where the matter, rather than the manner, is the subject of study. But in the Holy Scriptures every peculiar expression, even at the risk of losing an idiomatic turn, *must* be retained. Many words, especially the prepositions, have a positive dogmatical and theological significance, and to qualify them by a popular turn, or dilute them by a paraphrase, is dangerous

in the extreme. It is here that the excellence of our Authorized Version is so notably conspicuous; while it is studiously close and literal, it also, for the most part, preserves the idiom of our language in the most happy and successful way. It has many of the merits of an idiomatic translation, and none of the demerits of what are popularly called literal translations, though they commonly only deserve the name of un-English metaphrases. A paraphrastic translation, such as that adopted by Messrs. Conybeare and Howson, I cannot but regard as in many ways unfitted for Holy Scripture. I have then adopted the Authorized Version, and have only permitted myself to depart from it where it appeared to be *incorrect, inexact, insufficient, or obscure*, whether from accident or (as is alleged) from design. The citations I have appended from eight other versions will perhaps prove interesting, and will show the general reader what a *concordia discors* prevails among all the older English Versions¹, and how closely and how faithfully the contributors to the Authorized Version adhered to their instructions to consult certain of the older translations, and not to depart from the Standard Version which had last preceded them, except distinctly necessitated. Thus the Authorized Version is the accumulation, as well as the last and most perfect form, of the theological learning of fully two hundred and thirty years. From such a translation he must be a bold and confident man who would depart far, without the greatest caution and circumspection.

IV. Finally, I feel myself bound to specify a few of the commentators to whom I am more especially indebted.

Of the older writers I have paid the most unremitting attention to Chrysostom and Theodoret: for the former especially, often as a scholar, always as an exegete, I entertain the greatest respect and admiration. Of our older English commentators Hammond has been of the greatest service to me; his scholarship is generally speaking very accurate, and his erudition profound. The short commentary of Bishop Fell I have never consulted without profit. Bengel's *Gnomon* has of course never been out of my hands. Of later writers I should wish to specify Dr Peile, from whose commentary I have derived many valuable suggestions. I frequently differ from him in the explanation of *vómos* without the article; but I have always found him an accurate scholar, and especially

¹ I have also consulted Abp. Newcome's, and all the later versions of any celebrity, even the Unitarian, but have derived from them no assistance whatever.

useful for his well-selected citations from Calvin. To the late lamented Professor Scholefield's *Hints for a New Translation* I have always attended. The translation of Conybeare and Howson has been of some use; but, as far as my experience goes, it appears the least happily executed portion of their valuable work. Dr Brown's *Expository Discourses on the Galatians* is a book written in an excellent spirit, of great use and value in an exegetical point of view, but not always to be relied upon as a grammatical guide. I cannot pass over Dr Bloomfield, though he has not been of so much use to me as I could have wished. To the recent German commentators I am under the greatest obligations, both in grammar and exegesis, though not in theology. Meyer more as a grammarian, De Wette more as an exegete, command the highest attention and respect; to the former especially, though a little too Atticistic in his prejudices, my fullest acknowledgments are due. The commentaries of Winer and Schott are both excellent; to the latter Meyer seems to have been greatly indebted. Usteri has generally caught most happily the spirit of his author; his scholarship is not profound, but his exegesis is very good. Rückert, more voluminous and more laborious, has always repaid the trouble of perusal. The two works in the best theological spirit are those of Olshausen and Windischmann: the latter, though a Romanist, and by no means uninfluenced by decided prejudices, always writes in a reverent spirit, and is commonly remarkable for good sense, and not unfrequently for his candour. Baumgarten-Crusius I have found of very little value. Hilgenfeld is very useful in historical questions, but has a bad tone in exegesis, and follows Meyer too closely to be of much use as an independent grammatical expositor.

These are not more than one-third of the expositors I have consulted, but are those which, for my own satisfaction, and the guidance of younger students, I should wish to specify.

I have now only to commit this first part of my work, with all its imperfections, faults, and errors, to the charitable judgment of the reader. I have written it alone and unassisted, with only a country clergyman's scanty supply of books, in a neighbourhood remote from large libraries and literary institutions; and though I have done my uttermost to overcome these great disadvantages, I can myself see and feel with deep regret how often I have failed. I commend myself then not only to the kind judgment, but I will also venture to add, the kind assistance of my readers; for I shall

receive and acknowledge with great thankfulness any rectifications of errors or any suggestions that may be addressed to me at the subjoined direction.

I will conclude with earnest prayer to Almighty God in the name of His ever-blessed Son, that He may so bless this poor and feeble effort to disclose the outward significance, the jots and the tittles of His word, that He may make it a humble instrument of awakening in the hearts of others the desire to look deeper into the inward meaning, to mark, to read, and to understand, and with a lowly and reverent spirit to ponder over the hidden mysteries, the deep warnings, and the exhaustless consolations of the Book of Life.

To Him be all honour, all glory, and all praise.

C. J. ELЛИCOTT.

GLASTON, UFFINGHAM,
September, 1854.



INTRODUCTION.

THIS animated, argumentative, and highly characteristic Epistle would appear to have been written by St Paul not very long after his journey through Galatia and Phrygia (Acts xviii. 23), and as the *ταχέως* (ch. i. 6) *seems* to suggest (but comp. notes, and see contra, Conyb. and Hows. *St Paul*, Vol. II. p. 164, ed. 2), towards the commencement of the lengthened abode at Ephesus (Autumn 54 or 55 to Pentecost 57 or 58; comp. Acts xix. 10, xx. 31, 1 Cor. xvi. 8), forming apparently the first of that series of Epistles (Gal., 1 Cor., 2 Cor., Rom.) which intervenes between the Epp. to the Thessalonians and the four Epp. of the first captivity (Col., Eph., Philem., Phil.). It was addressed to the churches of the province of Galatia (ch. i. 2),—a province of which the inhabitants could not only boast a Gallic origin, but also appear to have retained some of the peculiarities of the Gallic character; see notes on ch. i. 6, iii. 1. The Epistle was not improbably encyclical in its character (see Olshaus. on ch. i. 2, and notes on ch. vi. 17), and was called forth by the somewhat rapid lapse of the Galatians into the errors of Judaism, which were now being disseminated by unprincipled and self-seeking teachers (comp. ch. vi. 12, 13) with a dangerous and perhaps malignant activity. Against these errors the Apostle had solemnly protested already (ch. i. 9), but, as this Epistle shows, with at present so little abiding effect, that the Judaizing teachers in Galatia, possibly recruited with fresh emissaries from Jerusalem, were now not only spreading dangerous error, but assailing the very apostolic

authority of him who had founded these churches (comp. ch. iv. 13), and who loved them so well (ch. iv. 19, 20).

In accordance with this the Epistle naturally divides itself into *two* controversial portions, and a concluding portion which is more directly hortatory and practical. The *first* portion (ch. i. ii.) the Apostle devotes to a *defence* of his office, and especially to a proof of his divine calling and of his independence of all human authority (ch. i. 11—ii. 10), nay, his very opposition to it in the person of St Peter, when that Apostle had acted with inconsistency (ch. ii. 11—21). In the *second*, or what may be called the *polemical* portion (ch. iii. iv.), the Apostle, both by argument (ch. iii.), appeal (ch. iv. 12—20), and illustration (ch. iv. 1—7, 21—30), establishes the truth of the fundamental positions that justification is by faith, and not by the deeds of the law (ch. iii. 5, 6), and that they alone who are of faith are the inheritors of the promise, and the true children of Abraham; comp. notes on ch. iii. 29. The *third* portion (ch. v. vi.) is devoted to hortatory warning (ch. iv. 31—v. 6), illustrations of what constitutes a *real* fulfilment of the law (ch. v. 13—26), practical instructions (ch. vi. 1—10), and a vivid recapitulation (ch. vi. 11—16).

The genuineness and authenticity are supported by distinct external testimony (Irenæus, *Hær.* III. 7. 2, Tertull. *de Praescr.* § 6: see Lardner, *Credibility*, Vol. II. p. 163 sq.; Davidson, *Introduction*, Vol. II. p. 318 sq.), and, as we might infer from the strikingly characteristic style of the Epistle, have never been doubted by any reputable critic; comp. Meyer, *Einleit.* p. 8.

ΠΡΟΣ ΓΑΛΑΤΑΣ.

Apostolic address and
salutation, concluding
with a doxology.

ΠΑΥΛΟΣ ἀπόστολος, οὐκ ἀπ' ἀν- I.
θρώπων οὐδὲ δι' ἀνθρώπου, αλλὰ

i. *ἀπόστολος*] ‘an Apostle,’ in the higher and more especial meaning of the word; and as such (particularly when enhanced by the succeeding clause) a forcible protest against the Judaists, who probably refused to apply it in this particular sense to any out of the significant number of the Twelve; comp. Hilgenf. *Galaterbrief*, p. 107. It may be observed (comp. Maurice, *Unity of N. T.* p. 402) that the question involved more than mere personal slander (*τὴν γεγενημένην διαβολήν* Theod.): in asserting the pre-eminence of the Twelve over St Paul, they were practically denying Christ’s perpetual rule over His church.

With regard to the meaning of *ἀπόστολος* in St Paul’s Epp., we may remark that in a few instances (e. g. 2 Cor. viii. 23, and most probably Phil. ii. 25, see notes *in loc.*), it appears to be used in its simple etymological sense. In 2 Cor. xi. 13, 1 Thess. ii. 6, the meaning may be thought doubtful; but in Rom. xvi. 7, *εἰτείς εἰσων ἐπίσημοι επαύλοις* (commonly cited in this sense, Conyb. and Hows. *St Paul*, Vol. i. p. 463), the correct translation appears certainly that of Fritzsche, ‘quippe qui in Apostolorum collegio bene audiant:’ comp. Winer, *RWB.*

s. v. *Apostel*, Vol. i. p. 69, note 2. The various applications of this word in eccles. writers are noticed by Suicer, *Thesaur.* s. v. Vol. i. p. 475 sq.; Hamm. *on Rom. xvi. 7.*
οὐκ δὲ διθράπων οὐδὲ δι' ἀνθρώπου] ‘not from men nor by man;’ ‘not from men as an ultimate, nor through man as a mediate authority,—the prep. *δι-* here correctly denoting the *causa remotior* (Winer, *Gr.* § 47 b, p. 331; Bernhardy, *Syntax*, v. 12, p. 222), *διά* the *causa medians*; see Winer, § 50. 6, p. 372; Green, *Gr.* p. 299. ‘*Ἄντε* is thus not ‘for *ἄντε*’ (Brown *in loc.*; comp. Rück., Olsh.), as the use of *ἄντε* for *ἄντε*, especially after passives, though found apparently in some few instances in earlier writers (Poppo, *Thucyd.* i. 17, Vol. i. p. 158), occasionally in later (Bernhardy, *Synt.* v. 12, p. 224), and frequently in Byzantine Greek, does not appear in St Paul’s Epistles, nor in any decisive instance in the N. T.; comp. Winer, *Gr.* § 47 b, p. 332, note. In all cases the distinction between the prep. seems sufficiently clear: *ἄντε* points to an action which results from a more immediate and *active*, *ἄντε* to a less immediate and more *passive cause*; comp. Herm. Soph. *Elect.* 65, and see *Rom. xiii. 1*.

διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ Θεοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ ἐγέιραντος

l. c. p. 372. *δι' ἄνθρακα]*
‘through man,’ οὐκ ἀνθρώπῳ χρησά-
μενος ἐπουργῷ Theod.—not with any
studied force in the singular as pointing
to any particular individual (Mosheim,
Reb. ante Constant. p. 70), nor yet for
solemnity’s sake, as more exclusive
(Alf.), but simply as thus forming
a more natural antithesis to the fol-
lowing διὰ Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

καὶ Θεὸν πατρός] ‘and God the Father;’ in noticeably close union with Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, both being under the vinculum of the single preposition διὰ, comp. ver. 3. We might here not unnaturally have expected *καὶ διὰ Θεοῦ πατρός*, as forming a more exact antithesis to what precedes, and as also obviating a ref. of διὰ to the *causa principalis* (Gal. i. 15); comp. however 1 Cor. i. 9; and see Winer, *Gr.* § 47, i, p. 339; and the list in Fritz. on *Rom.* i. 5, Vol. I. 15,—but exclude from it 1 Pet. ii. 13, 14. In the present case the use of διὰ seems due partly to a brevity of expression, which is obviously both natural and admissible where it is not necessary to draw strict lines between agency, origin, and medium (comp. *Rom.* xi. 36, and even Plato, *Sympos.* p. 186 B, διὰ τοῦ θεοῦ κυβερνᾶται), and partly to an instinctive association of the two

Persons of the blessed Trinity in his choice and calling as an Apostle. To urge this as a *direct* evidence for the *δυονούσα* of the Father and the Son (Chrys., Theod.) may perhaps be rightly deemed precarious; yet still there is something *very noticeable* in this use of a common preposition with both the first and second Persons of the Trinity by a writer so cumulative, and yet for the most part so exact, in his use of prepositions as St Paul. Θεοῦ πατέρος]

Θεοῦ πατρός]

'*God the Father*,' not in the ordinary inclusive reference to all men (De W., Alf.), nor with more particular reference to Christians, scil. '*our Father*' (Ust. al.), but, as the associated clause seems rather to suggest, with special and exclusive reference to the preceding subject, our Lord Jesus Christ: so,

perhaps too expressly, Syr. **بَرْكَةٌ**

[patrem ejus]; comp. Pearson, *Creed*, Art. I. Vol. I. p. 42 (ed. Burt.).

τοῦ ἑνίκας κ.τ.λ.] ‘who raised Him from the dead.’ The addition of this designation has been very differently explained. While there may probably be a *remote* reference to the fact that it is upon the resurrection of Jesus Christ that our faith rests (1 Cor. xv. 17; comp. Usteri, *Paul. Lehrbegr.* II. I. I., p. 97, 98), and from it all gifts of grace derived (Alf.), the context seems clearly to suggest that the more *immediate* reference is to the fact that the Apostle’s call was received from Christ in His exalted and glorified position (1 Cor. ix. 1, 1 Cor. xv. 8); ‘verax etiam novissimus Apostolus qui per Jesum Christum totum jam Deum post resurrectionem ejus missus est.’ August. in loc.; see Brown, *Galatians*, p. 22. The article with *νεκρῷ* appears regu-

αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν, καὶ οἱ σὺν ἐμοὶ πάντες ἀδελφοί, ταῖς 2
ἐκκλησίαις τῆς Γαλατίας. χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ 3
Θεοῦ πατρὸς καὶ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τοῦ 4

larly omitted in this and similar phrases, except Eph. v. 14, and (with δωδέκα) Matth. xiv. 2, xxviii. 7, al.; see Winer, *Gr.* § 19, p. 112.

2. *πάντες*] Emphatic: ‘ceteros qui secum erant omnes commotis adversus eos ostendit.’ Ps.-Ambr. St Paul frequently adds to his own name that of one or more of his companions, e.g. Sosthenes (1 Cor. i. 1), Timothy (2 Cor. i. 1, Phil. i. 1, Col. i. 1), Silvanus and Timothy (1 Thess. i. 1, 2 Thess. i. 1): here however, to add weight to his admonitions, and to show the unanimity (Chrysost.) that was felt on the subject of the Epistle, he adopts the inclusive term *πάντες δόμελφοι*, defining it more closely by *οἱ σὺν ἐμοὶ* (Phil. iv. 21),—‘all the brethren who are my present companions in my travels and my preaching.’ There is then no necessity for restricting *δόμελφοι* to ‘official brethren’ (Brown; comp. Beza), nor for extending *οἱ σὺν ἐμοὶ* to the whole Christian community of the place from which the Epistle was written (Erasm., Jowett); in this latter case we should certainly have expected ‘with whom I am,’ rather than ‘who are with me,’ see Usteri *in loc.*

ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῆς Γαλ.] ‘to the churches of Galatia,’ plural, and with a comprehensive reference (*πανταχοῦ γὰρ εἰρύεται η νόσος*, Theod., comp. Chrys.), the epistle probably being an encyclical letter addressed to the different churches (of Ancyra, Pessinus, Tavium, and other places) throughout the province. The omission of the usual titles of honour or affection seems undoubtedly intentional (Chrys.), for in the only other Epistles where

the simple *τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ* is used (1 Cor. i. 2, 2 Cor. i. 1, 1 Thess. i. 1, 2 Thess. i. 1) there is in the two former passages the important and qualifying addition *τοῦ Θεοῦ*, and in the two latter *ἐν Θεῷ πατρὶ κ.τ.λ.*

3. *χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη*] ‘Grace to you and peace:’ not merely a union of two ordinary forms of Jewish salutation (Fritz. *Rom.* i. 7, Vol. I. p. 23), or of the Greek *χάρις* and the Hebrew *תְּהִלָּה*, but a greeting of full spiritual significance; *χάρις*, as Olsh. observes, being the divine love manifesting itself to man, *εἰρήνη* the state that results from a reception of it. The Oriental and Occidental forms of salutation are thus blended and spiritualized in the Christian greeting; see notes on *Eph.* i. 2, and comp. Koch on *1 Thessal.* p. 60. καὶ Κυρίου κ.τ.λ.] ‘and (from) our Lord Jesus Christ.’ Strictly speaking, Christ is the mediating imparter of Grace, God the direct giver; but just as in verse 1, διὸ was applied both to the Father and the Son, so here, in this customary salutation (see on *Phil.* i. 2), δρός is applied both to the Son and the Father. Olshausen (on *Rom.* i. 7) justly remarks that nothing speaks more decisively for the divinity of our Lord than these juxtapositions with the Father, which pervade the whole language of Scripture.

4. *τοῦ δόντος ἁυρόν*] ‘Who gave Himself,’ scil. to death; more fully expressed 1 Tim. ii. 6, δόντος ἁυρόν’ comp. Tit. ii. 14. The participial clause serves at the very outset to specify the active principle of the error of the Galatians. The

δόντος ἑαυτὸν περὶ τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν, ὅπως ἔξεληται
ἡμᾶς ἐκ τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος αἰώνος τονηροῦ κατὰ τὸ θέλημα

doctrine of the atoning death of Jesus Christ, and a recurrence to the laws of Moses, were essentially incompatible with each other. *περὶ τῶν διαπτ. ἡμῶν*] ‘for our sins,’ scil. to atone for them, Rom. iii. 25, Gal. iii. 13. The reading *ὑπὲρ* (*Rec.*) has but little external support, and is perhaps due to dogmatical correction, or to that interchange of *περὶ* and *ὑπὲρ* (*Fritz Rom.* Vol. I. p. 28) of which the MSS. of the N. T. present so many traces. Strictly speaking, *ὑπέρ*, in its ethical sense, retains some trace of its local meaning, ‘bending over to protect’ (*μάχεσθαι ὑπέρ των* Donalds. *Gr. Gr.* § 48o. b), and thus points more immediately to the action, than to the object or circumstance from which the action is supposed to spring. The latter relation is more correctly defined by *περὶ*,—e. g. *φοβεῖσθαι περὶ των*: see Winer, *Gr.* § 47. e, p. 334; Schaefer, *Demosth.* Vol. I. p. 189, 190. *Ὑπέρ* will thus be more naturally used with the thing, ‘sins,’—*ὑπὲρ* with the person, ‘sinners;’ and this, with a few exceptions (e. g. 1 Cor. xv. 3, Heb. v. 3), appears the usage of the N. T.; comp. 1 Pet. iii. 18, where both forms occur. Still it must be admitted that both in the N. T. and even in classical Greek (*Buttm. Ind. ad Mid.* p. 188) the distinction between these two preps. is often scarcely appreciable; see notes on *Eph.* vi. 19, and on *Phil.* i. 7. *ὅπως ἔξεληται*] ‘in order that he might deliver us;’ not ‘eximeret,’ Beza, but ‘eriperet,’ Vulg.—the verb *ἔξαρεῖσθαι* (only here in St Paul’s Epp.) deriving from the context the idea of *rescuing* (*δύναμις σημαίνει τοῦ βυσσαμένου* Theod.-Mops.) as from danger, &c. comp.

Acts xii. 11, xxiii. 27, and appy. xxvi. 17, and see Elsner, *Obs. Vol. II.* p. 170. On the force of *ὅπως* in the N. T., and its probable distinction from *ὅτι*, see notes on 2 *Thess.* i. 12. *ἐκ τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος κ.τ.λ.*] ‘out of the present evil world,’ not exactly *ἐκ τῶν πρότερων τῶν πονηρῶν*, Chrysost., still less *τοῦ παρόντος βίου*, Theod., but simply,—‘the present evil state of things;’ see notes on *Eph.* i. 21, where the meaning of *αἰών* is briefly discussed. It is doubtful whether *ὁ ἐνεστῶς αἰών* is (a) simply equivalent to *ὁ νῦν αἰών* (2 Tim. iv. 10, Tit. ii. 12, see notes), and therefore in opposition to *ὁ αἰών μελλων* (comp. Clem. *Cor.* II. 6, *ὅτιν* δὲ οὐτος ὁ αἰών καὶ ὁ μελλων δύο ἔχθροι), or whether (b) it denotes in a more restricted sense ‘the commencing age,’ the age of faithlessness and the developing powers of Antichrist that had already begun; see Meyer in loc. The participle *ἐνεστῶς* will appy. admit either meaning (comp. *Rom.* viii. 38, 1 *Cor.* iii. 22, with 2 *Thess.* ii. 2; and see exx. in Rost u. Palm, *Lex. s. v.* Vol. I. p. 929; Schweigh. *Lex. Polyb.* s. v.); the order of the words however,—not *τοῦ τονηροῦ αἰώνος τοῦ ἐνεστῶς*,—and the general and undogmatical character of the passage seem decidedly in favour of (a): so distinctly Syr.

ἵστι βασιλέας [hoc sæculo], Vulg., Clarom., ‘presenti sæculo,’ and sim. the best of the remaining Vv. In either case the influence of the article appears to extend only to *ἐνεστῶτος· αἰώνος πονηροῦ* forming an explanatory apposition, in effect equivalent to a tertiary predication (Donalds. *Gr.* § 489), ‘an evil age as it is,’ and pointing out either (a) more generally, or

τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς ἡμῶν, φὴ δόξα εἰς τὸν αἰώνα 5
τῶν αἰώνων ἀμήν.

(b) more specifically, the corrupting influences of the world and its works; see esp. Donalds. *Journal of Sacr. and Class. Philol.* No. II. p. 223. The reading *aiōnos tō̄ētō̄*, adopted by Lachm., has not strong external support [ABN; 39; Orig. (3), Did., al.], and is internally suspicious as a grammatical correction. Θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς ἡμῶν] ‘God and our Father,’ ‘Dei et patris nostri,’ Vulg.; —not ‘God, even our Father’ (Brown), *καὶ* being only the simple copula; see Middleton, *Greek Art.* p. 292, 367 (ed. Rose), and comp. notes on 1 Thess. iii. 11. The august title δὲ Θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ occurs several times in the N.T., both alone (1 Cor. xv. 24, Eph. v. 20, James i. 27), and with a dependent genitive, viz. (a) *tō̄ētō̄ Kυρίου ἡμῶν* I. X., Rom. xv. 6, Eph. i. 3, 2 Cor. i. 3, 1 Pet. i. 3 (cf. 2 Cor. xi. 31, Col. i. 3); and (b) *ἡμῶν* only, as here, Phil. iv. 20, 1 Thess. iii. 11, 13, and 2 Thess. ii. 16. Whether in these latter formulæ the gen. depends on both, or only on the latter of the two nouns cannot be positively decided. No grammatical arguments based on the absence of the article are here applicable, as πατὴρ is anarthrous according to rule (Middl. *Gr. Art.* III. 4, § 2; Winer, *Gr.* § 19. 4, p. 116); nor will the most careful investigation of the separate passages afford any *sure* grounds for deciding on *exegetical* principles; contr. Fritz. *Rom.* Vol. III. p. 234. This however may be said, that as the term πατὴρ conveys necessarily a *relative* idea, which in theological language admits of many applications (see Suicer, *Thesaur.* s.v. Vol. II. p. 629 sq.), while Θεὸς conveys only one *absolute*

idea, it would not seem improbable that the connexion of thought in the mind of the inspired writer might lead him in some passages to add a defining gen. to πατὴρ which he did not intend necessarily to be referred to Θεός. The Greek commentators, whose opinion on such a point would be of great value, do not appear to be unanimous. Theod.-Mops. in loc. and Theodoret on *Rom.* xvi. 6, refer the gen. to the last nom.; Chrys. on *Eph.* i. 3, leaves it doubtful; see notes on *Eph.* i. 3.

5. η δόξα] ‘the glory,’ scil. *εἴη* not *εἶτω*; see on *Eph.* i. 2. In this and similar forms of doxology,—excepting that of the angels, Luke ii. 14, and of the multitude, Luke xix. 38,—δόξα regularly takes the article when used alone, e.g. Rom. xi. 36, xvi. 27, Eph. iii. 21, Phil. iv. 20, 2 Tim. iv. 18, Heb. xiii. 21, 2 Pet. iii. 18. When joined with one or more substantives it appears sometimes with the art. (1 Pet. iv. 11, Rev. i. 6, vii. 12), sometimes without it (Rom. ii. 10, 1 Tim. i. 17, Jude 25). It is thus difficult to determine whether we have here (a) the ‘rhetorical’ form of the article (Bernhardy, *Synt.* VI. 22, p. 315), ‘the glory which especially and alone belongs to God’ (comp. Winer, *Gr.* § 18. 1, p. 97), or (b) whether δόξα takes the article as an abstract noun (Middl. *Gr. Art.* V. 1). On the whole, (a) seems the most natural, and best suited to the context.

αἰώνας τῶν αἰώνων] ‘the ages of the ages,’ ‘secula saeculorum,’ Vulg.; less precisely Syr. [seculum saeculorum]: a semi-Hebraistic expression for a duration of time

6 Θαυμάζω ὅτι οὕτως ταχέως μετα-
τίθεσθε ἀπὸ τοῦ καλέσαντος ὑμᾶς ἐν
to preach, let him be anathema.

I marvel at your
speedy lapse to another gospel, which
even if an angel were

It is not man but God whom I strive to please.

superlatively (infinitely) long; comp. Winer, *Gr.* § 36. 2, p. 220. The same words occur, Phil. iv. 20, 1 Tim. i. 17, 2 Tim. iv. 18, and frequently in the Apocalypse. Occasionally we meet with the singular *αἰών τῶν αἰώνων* (Eph. iii. 21, comp. Dan. vii. 18), and the perhaps more distinctly Hebraistic *αἰών τοῦ αἰώνος*, Heb. i. 8 (quotation), Psalm cxi. 10,—but with scarcely any appreciable difference of meaning; see notes on *Eph.* iii. 21. Vorst (*de Hebraismis N. T.* p. 325) investigates both this and the similar expression *γενέδες γενεῶν*, but his remarks must be received with caution, as on the subject of Hebraisms he cannot now be considered a safe guide.

Θαυμάζω] ‘I marvel;’ ‘manifestis beneficiis, mirari se dicit quod ab Illo potuerint separari.’ Ps.-Jerome. The idea of wondering at something *blameworthy* is frequently implied in this word: see Rost u. Palm, *Lex. s.v.*, and compare Mark vi. 6, John vii. 21, 1 John iii. 13. The further idea which Chrys. finds in the address, οὐ μόνον ἐντρέπων... δύον δὲ καὶ δεικνὺς οἷς ἔχει περὶ αὐτῶν ὑπένοιαν, ὅτι μεγάλην τιὰ καὶ ἐπον-
δασμένην,—does not seem intended.
οὕτως ταχέως] ‘so quickly.’ After what? In our ignorance of the exact time when the Galatians were converted, as well as the circumstances of their defection, this question cannot be satisfactorily answered. Of the proposed answers—(a) their conversion, Mey., Alf.; (b) the Apostle’s last visit, Beng., Flatt; or (c) the entry of the false teachers, Chrys., Theoph.—the first appears the least, and the last the most probable, as the follow-

ing verse seems to show who the Apostle had in his thoughts. At any rate the reference of the adverb seems decidedly rather to *time* than *manner* (2 Thess. ii. 2, 1 Tim. v. 22, comp. Conyb. and Hows. *in loc.*), however that time be defined. Still all historical deductions from such a passage (Wieseler, *Chronol.* p. 285, Davids. *Introduct.* Vol. II. p. 297) must obviously be debateable and precarious. Grotius appositely cites in illustration of the levity of the Gallic character, Caesar, *Bell. Gall.* IV. 5, ‘sunt (Galli) in consiliis capiendis mobiles, et novis plerunque rebus student;’ comp. *ib.* II. 1, III. 10, 19; see Elsner, *Observ. Sacr.* Vol. II. p. 172.

μετατίθεσθε] ‘are going over from, are falling away from:’ present (οὐκ εἴτε μετέθεσθε, ἀλλά, μετατίθεσθε: Chrys.—the defection was still going on), and middle, not passive, as Theod.-Mops. (μετάγεσθε, ὡς ἐπὶ ἀψύχων comp. Heb. vii. 12), Vulg., Clarom., al. While in earlier writers *μετατίθεμαι* is used both with and without an accusative (*γνώμην*), in the sense of ‘changing an opinion’ (see exx. in Rost u. Palm, *Lex. s.v.*), it is as frequently used in later writers in the sense ‘descisco,’ with prepp. *εἰς*, *πρὸς*, *ἐπὶ* of the party, &c. to whom—e.g. Polyb. III. 118. 8, *μετατίθεσθαι πρὸς τοὺς Καρχηδονίους*—and *ἐκ*, *ἀπό* (or a simple gen., Diod. Sic. XVI. 31), of the party &c. from whom the defection has taken place; so Appian, *Bell. Mithr.* 41, ἀπὸ Ἀρχελάου πρὸς Σόλλαν *μετατίθεσθαι*: comp. 2 Macc. vii. 24; and see further exx. in Kypke, *Obs.* Vol. II. p. 273; and in Wetst. *in loc.* **τοῦ καλέσαντος**] ‘Him who called you,’ scil. God the

χάριτι Χριστοῦ εἰς ἔτερον εὐαγγέλιον, ὃ οὐκ ἔστιν 7

Father (Chrys., Theod.), to whom the calling of Christians appears regularly ascribed by St Paul (ver. 15, Rom. viii. 30, ix. 24, 1 Cor. i. 9, vii. 15, 17, 1 Thess. ii. 12, 2 Thess. ii. 14, 2 Tim. i. 9)—not ‘*Christ* who called you,’ Syr., Jerome, al., the correct theological distinction being, ἡ μὲν κλήσις ἔστι τοῦ Πατρός, τῆς δὲ κλήσεως ἡ αἵρεσις τοῦ Τίτου’ Chrys.; comp. Rom. v. 15. Brown (p. 39) excepts Rom. i. 6, but scarcely with sufficient reason; see Fritz. and De W. in loc., and comp. Reuss, *Theol. Chr̄st.* IV. 15, Vol. II. p. 144; Usteri, *Lehrb.* II. 2. 3, p. 269, 279 sq. The passages cited by Alford on *Rom.* i. 6, viz. John v. 25, 1 Tim. i. 12, do not seem fully in point.

[*ἐν χάριτι*]

‘*by the grace of Christ*;’ holy instrument of the divine calling, the prep. *ἐν* being here used in its instrumental sense (*Eph.* ii. 13, vi. 14, al.), and marking not so much the element *in* which, as the principle *by* which (immanent instrumentality, Jelf, *Gr.* § 622. 3, comp. notes on *Eph.* ii. 13) the calling was vouchsafed unto mankind; see notes on *1 Thess.* iv. 18, and comp. Winer, *Gr.* § 48. a, p. 347. De Wette and Meyer both adduce 1 Cor. vii. 15, *ἐν δὲ εἰρήνῃ κέκληκεν ὑμᾶς δὲ Θεός*, but not pertinently, as both there and in the two other passages in which *καλεῖν* is joined with *ἐν*, viz. Eph. iv. 4, 1 Thess. iv. 7 (see notes in loc.), the prep. retains its simple and primary force of ‘permanence in,’ and marks, as it were, the element *in which* we are called to move. In the present case however, the *dogmatical* consideration that the Grace of Christ, in the sense it here appears used by St Paul, denotes an active and energizing influence rather than a passive

element, seems distinctly to suggest the instrumental sense; comp. Rom. v. 15, and see Meyer and Hilgenf. in loc.

The usual explanation, according to which *ἐν* is used ‘*in sensu prægnanti*’ for *εἰς* (‘*vocavit in gratiam*,’ Vulg., Auth.), is more than doubtful, as *καλέω* implies no idea of motion (comp. Winer, *Gr.* § 50. 4. a, p. 367), while that of Wieseler (*Chronol.* p. 285, note), according to which *τὸν χρόνον = χρόνῳ* (ch. iii. 19), is alike inconsistent with the usage of *ἐν*, and with the regular meaning of *χρόνος Χριστοῦ*.

[*Ἐτερον*]

‘*another sort of.*’ Fell. If we compare the very similar passage, 2 Cor. xi. 4, in which *Ἐτερος* and *ἄλλος* occur in juxtaposition, and apparently in senses exactly identical with those in the present passage, it will not seem necessary to lay any stress on *ἔτερον* as implying either (a) ‘bad,’ ‘perverted’ (comp. Plato, *Phileb.* p. 13 A, *ἔτερον δυομά*; Pind. *Pyth.* III. 34 [60] *δαίμων ἔτερος*; see Rost u. Palm, *Lex.* s.v. Vol. I. p. 1202; Wetst. on 1 Tim. v. 25), or even (b) ‘strange,’ Scholef. *Hints.* p. 88 (ed. 3), comp. Jude 7;—as both here and 2 Cor. l.c. *Ἐτερος* appears only to refer to distinction of kind, *ἄλλος* of individuality; ‘*ἔτερος non tantum alium sed diversum significat;*’ Tittm. *Synon.* p. 155; comp. Plato, *Sympos.* p. 186 B, *ἔτερόν τε καὶ δύομοιν.* It must be admitted however that this distinction is not always kept up in the N. T.; see Matth. xi. 3, 1 Cor. xv. 39.

7. *οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλο, εἰ μὴ κ.τ.λ.*]
‘Which is NOT another, save that, &c.’
 The various interpretations of these words turn mainly on the antecedent assigned to *δ*: this may be (a) the whole sentence, *θτι—εὐαγγέλιον*, ‘*quod quidem* (scil. vos deficere a

ἄλλο, εἰ μή τινές εἰσιν οἱ ταράσσοντες ὑμᾶς καὶ θέλοντες μεταστρέψαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ. ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐὰν ἡμεῖς ἡ ἄγγελος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ εὐαγγελίζηται ὑμῖν

Christo) non est aliud nisi; Winer; (b) the preceding *εὐαγγέλιον*, 'which Gospel is, admits of being, no other,' De W. (comp. Syr., Chrys., Theod.) and appy. the majority of expositors; (c) the preceding compound expression *ἔτερον εὐαγγέλιον* Meyer, Alf. Of these (c) is clearly to be preferred, as best preserving the natural and grammatical sequence of the words, and the distinction between *ἔτερος* and *ἄλλος*. To prevent the words *ἔτερον εὐαγγέλιον* being misconstrued into the admission that there could *really* be any other gospel than the one preached to them, St Paul more fully explains himself, using *ἄλλος* rather than the ambiguous *ἔτερος*, and throwing the emphasis on *οὐκ*, 'which (*ἔτερον εὐαγγέλιον*) is *not* another (a second) GOSPEL, except (only in this sense, that) there are some who trouble you,' i.e. the Judaists bring you another gospel, but it is really no GOSPEL at all; comp. Hamm. and Meyer *in loc.* In a word, as Hilgenfeld correctly observes, the seeming paradox lies in this fact, that *εὐαγγέλιον* is understood after *ἄλλο* in its strictest meaning, but expressed after *ἔτερον* in one more lax. εἰ μή] 'save that.' The gloss εἰ μή=ἄλλα can be distinctly impugned in even what seem the strongest passages, e.g. Matth. xii. 4 (see Fritz. *in loc.*), 1 Cor. vii. 17 (see Meyer *in loc.*): consult Klotz, *Devar.* Vol. II. p. 524; Hartung, *Partik.* μή, 3. 6, Vol. II. p. 120, compared with Dindorf in Steph. *Thes.* Vol. III. p. 190. The first distinct evidences of this interchange appear only in very late writers. οἱ ταράσσοντες] 'who are troubling

you;' 'qui vos conturbant.' Vulg. The definite article might at first sight seem inconsistent with the indef. *rūes*: when thus used however, it serves to particularize, and in the present case specifies, the *rūes* as those whose characteristic was troubling the Galatians, 'some who are your troublemakers;' comp. Luke xviii. 9, *τυδὲ τοὺς πεποθότας*; Col. ii. 8, *μὴ τις ὑμᾶς ἔσται δ συλλαγωγῶν*. Winer (*Gr.* § 18. 3, p. 100) adduces some exx. from classical Greek, and compares the common expr. *εἰσω οἱ λέγοντες* see also Bernhardy, *Synt.* VI. 23, p. 318. We cannot therefore with Rückert definitely pronounce this as an instance of Asiatic Hellenism. The article must of course be carried on to *θέλοντες*: see Kühner's valuable note on *Xen. Mem.* L I. 20.

τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ] It is doubtful whether *Χριστοῦ* is the gen. *subjecti*, 'the Gospel preached by Christ,' or the gen. *objecti*, 'the Gospel of, or concerning, Christ.' From the fuller expression, Rom. i. 1, 3, *εὐαγγέλιον Θεοῦ...περὶ τοῦ νιοῦ αὐτοῦ*, we may perhaps here decide on the latter interpretation: see Winer, *Gr.* § 30. 1, p. 160. According to Meyer (*on Mark* i. 1), when the gen. after *εὐαγγέλ. is σωτῆρας, βασιλεῖς, κ.τ.λ.* it is gen. *objecti*; when *Θεοῦ*, gen. *subjecti*; but when *Χριστοῦ*, gen. *objecti* or *subjecti*, to be determined only by the context.

8. καὶ τάν] 'even if,' not however necessarily 'supposing a case which has never occurred' (Alf.), but, as usual, conveying the idea of condition with the assumption of objective possibility; see Herm. *de Partic.* δ,

παρ' ὁ εὐηγγελισάμεθα ὑμῖν, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω. ὡς προει- 9

2. 7, p. 95, and esp. the very clear distinctions of Schmalfeld, *Synt. d. Gr. Verb.* § 93, 94. It may be further observed that, as the order shows, *kai* belongs not to *ἡμεῖς* or to the sentence, but to *έδε* (*etiam si*), to which it gives force and prominence; see Herm. Viger, No. 307; Hartung, *Partic. kai*, 3. 3, Vol. I. p. 141; and notes on *Phil.* ii. 17.

ἡμεῖς] ‘we.’ Though *ἡμεῖς* here seems to refer mainly to St Paul, and is frequently so used elsewhere, yet, as of *οὐράνιοι π. δέλ.* may very reasonably be here included (Mey.), it does not seem desirable, with De W., Conyb., and others, to limit the term specially to the Apostle. The use of *ἡμεῖς*, or of the simple plural, must always depend on the context; comp. notes on *1 Thess.* i. 2.

παρ' οἷ] ‘contrary to that which.’ The meaning of the prep. has been the subject of considerable controversy; the Lutherans having urged the meaning *praterquam* (Vulg. and appy. Chrys.), the Romanists that of *contra* (Theod., al.). The latter meaning is perfectly correct (opp. to Brown, p. 45; see Donalds, *Gr.* § 485, and exx. in Winer, *Gr.* § 49. g, p. 360, esp. Xen. *Mem.* I. 1. 18, where *παρὰ τοὺς νόμους* and *κατὰ τ. ν.* are in antithesis), and is appy. required by the context and tenor of the argument. The Apostle implies throughout the Epistle that the Judaical gospel was in the strict sense of the words a *πρεπων εὐαγγ.*, and in its very essence *opposed to the true Gospel*.

διάθεμα] ‘accursed;’ strictly considered, nothing more than the Hellenistic form of the Attic *διάθημα*, Moeris (cited by Lobeck, *Phryn.* p. 249), the original meaning of both forms being τὸ *ἀφειρωμένον Θεῷ*. The-

odore on *Rom.* ix. 3. The prevailing use however of *διάθεμα* in *malam partem*, compared with the command, Lev. xxvii. 28, seems (esp. in the LXX and the N.T.) to have gradually led to a distinction in meaning; *διάθημα* being used in the sense of *donarium* (2 Macc. ix. 16, Luke xxi. 5, but cf. var. lect.), *διάθεμα* (*Rom.* ix. 3, 1 Cor. xii. 3, xvi. 22) as ‘*ali- quid divina ira sacramum;*’ Hesych. *διάθεμα*· *ἐπικαρδίας, ἀκριβής.* *διάθημα*· *κύριμημα.* This distinction, though very generally, is still not universally observed: see Theod. and esp. Chrys. on *Rom.* ix. 3, who, even while he asserts two distinct meanings, seems to regard the forms as interchangeable. In the Eccles. writers (see Suicer, *Thes.* Vol. I. p. 268, Bingham, XVI. 2) *διάθεμα*, like the Hebrew *דָמִים* (see Winer, *RWB. Art. Bann*), was applied to excommunication; though even here, it may be observed, accompanied sometimes with distinct execration; see Bingham, ib. 2. 17. This milder sense has been frequently maintained in the present passage (Hammond in loc., Waterland, *Doct. Trin.* ch. 4, Vol. III. p. 458), but is distinctly opposed to the usage of the N.T.; compare *ἐπικαρδίας*, ch. iii. 10; *κατάρα*, ch. iii. 13. For further reff. see the good note of Fritz. on *Rom.* ix. 3, Vol. II. p. 253 sq.

9. *προειρήκαμεν*] ‘we have said before.’ To what does *πρό* here refer? Is it (a) solely to the preceding verse, as Chrys., Theod., Jerome (comp. Neander, *Planting.* Vol. I. p. 214, Bohn), or (b) to a declaration made at the Apostle’s last visit, as Syr. (appy.), and recently, Ust., De W., Mey., al.? Grammatical considerations do not contribute to a decision: for nei-

ρήκαμεν, καὶ ἄρτι πάλιν λέγω, εἴ τις ὑμᾶς εὐαγγελίζειο ται παρ' ὁ παρελάβετε, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω. ἄρτι γὰρ

ther, on the one hand, can the use of the perfect rather than the aor. (which is used in ch. v. 21, 1 Thess. iv. 6) be pressed in favour of (a).—*εἰρηκα* at most only marking the continuing validity of what was said (comp. 2 Cor. xii. 9, and Winer, *Gr.* § 40. 4, p. 243),—nor, on the other hand, can the reference to what has just been said be urged as inconsistent with the usage of *πρό* (Ust.), for see 2 Macc. iii. 7, *προειρημένων χρημάτων* (where the subject referred to is mentioned no further back than the beginning of the preceding verse), 3 Macc. vi. 35; and compare 2 Cor. viii. 3 with 2 Cor. vi. 11. *Contextual* reasons however, viz. the insertion of *δρι* as marking an antithesis to what was distinctly *past*, and the apparent identity of time marked by the two plural verbs *εὐηγγελ.*, *προειρ.* (Alf.), seems so distinctly in favour of (b), that in this case we do not hesitate to maintain that reference even in opposition to the opinion of the Greek expositors; comp. 2 Cor. xiii. 2. This passage has been pressed into the controversy relative to the state of the Galatian church at the Apostle's second visit; see Davidson, *Introd.* Vol. II. p. 305. καὶ δρι κ.τ.λ.] ‘so now I say again,’ undoubtedly a consecutive sentence. Rückert and B.-Crus., by making it part of the antecedent sentence, retain the more Attic meaning of *δρι*, but suppose an intolerably harsh ellipsis before *εἰ τις*. ‘*Ἄρτι* is not used in Attic Greek for purely present time—comp. Plato, *Meno*, p. 89 c, where *ἐν τῷ νῦν* is in opp. to *ἐν τῷ δρι*—but is not uncommonly so used in later Greek; see esp. Lobeck, *Phryn.* p. 18 sq. δ...εὐαγγελισται] ‘if any one preacheth,’ simply

and purely conditional (‘*el cum indic. nihil significat praeter conditionem,*’ Klotz, *Devar.* Vol. II. p. 455), ‘if, as a matter of fact, preaching is a course of action pursued by any one,’ be such an assumption reasonable or the contrary; see esp. Schmalfeld, *Syntax*, § 91, p. 195. This change from the more restricted *ἔτει* with subj. in ver. 8, *appears* here intentional; comp. Acts v. 38, 39. Still such distinctions must not be overpressed, as there is abundant evidence to show that not only in later, but even sometimes in earlier writers, they were not always carefully observed; see Madvig, *Gr.* § 125. I. It is certainly noticeable that in Euclid (*e.g.* Book I. Prop. 4) *ἔτει* with subj. is nearly always used in mathematical hypotheses, where there can be *no* accessory idea, but where experience must prove the truth or fallacy of the supposition: see Winer, *Gr.* § 41. 2, p. 260, note. This use of *εὐαγγελίζομαι* with an accus. *personæ* is a *δωξις λεγόμ.* in St Paul's Epp., but occurs elsewhere both in the N. T. (Luke iii. 18, Acts viii. 25, 40, xiii. 32, xiv. 15, 21, xvi. 10, 1 Pet. i. 12), and in later writers: comp. Winer, *Gr.* § 32. 1. p. 199, and Lobeck, *Phryn.* p. 267 sq.

io. δρι γάρ] ‘For now,’ not contrasting his present conduct and former Pharisaism (Neander, *Planting*, Vol. I. p. 222 [Bohn]; Wieseler, *Chronol.* p. 178), but emphatically repeating the *δρι* of the preceding verse, and calling especial attention to his present words; ‘Now,—when I am using such unhesitating language.’ The exact force of *γάρ* seems more open to question: it may be plausibly taken as in abrupt and ironical reference to the charges of the

ἀνθρώπους πείθω ἢ τὸν Θεόν; ἢ ζητῶ ἀνθρώποις
ἀρέσκειν; εἰ ἔτι ἀνθρώποις ἡρεσκον, Χριστοῦ δοῦλος
οὐκ ἀν ἥμην.

The Gospel I preach
is not of man; and I
will confirm this by stating my mode of life before my conversion.

11. δέ] The external authorities for this reading are AD³EKLN; many
Vv. (Æth.-Pol. and others omit entirely); Chrys., Theod., al.; Ambrst. (Rec.,

Judaists; 'well! am I now, &c.' (on
this idiomatic use of γάρ, see esp.
Klotz, *Devar.* Vol. II. p. 245) but
is perhaps more naturally regarded
as *argumentative*, — not however so
much with ref. to the seeming harsh-
ness of his previous words (Mey.,
Alf.,) as to their *unquestionable truth*,
the best proof of which lay in his
being one who was making God his
friend, and not men; see Olsh. and
Hilgenf. *in loc.*

πείθω] 'am

I persuading? ~~πείθω σοι~~ [sum
persuadens] Syr., 'suadeo,' Vulg., Clarom.; scil. 'am I making friends of?'
the slight modification of meaning,
viz. 'persuadendo mihi concilio,' as
suggested by the latter words of the
clause, being easily supplied from the
context; see *Acts* xii. 20, 2 Macc.
iv. 45, and comp. πείσαι τὸν Θεόν
(with inf.), Joseph. *Antiq.* IV. 6. 5,
VI. 5. 6, VIII. 10. 3. The usual com-
ment that πείθω is here used *de
conatu* (Ust., al.) is very questionable.
Of the passages cited in support of
this meaning, *Acts* xxviii. 23 cer-
tainly proves nothing, and *Ælian*, *Var.
Hist.* II. 6 is not to the point, 'at-
tempt' being implied not by the verb
but its tense. The same obs. seems
applicable to Xenoph. *Hell.* VI. 5. 16;
Polyb. *Hist.* IV. 64. 2; cited in Steph.
Thes. s. v. η [ηγρά κ. λ.]
'or am I seeking to please, &c.' not
merely a different (De W.), but a
more general and comprehensive

statement of the preceding clause.
The student will find a sound sermon
on this verse by Farindon, *Serm. XXI.*
Vol. II. p. 139 (ed. 1849).

ἢ δὲ δύθ. ἡρεσκον] 'I were still pleasing
men.' It is not necessary either to
press the use of the imperf. *de conatu*,
or to modify the meaning of ἀρέσκω,
'studet placere,'—a meaning which
it never bears; see Fritz, *Rom.* xv.
2, Vol. III. p. 221, note. The apostle
says, 'I am not pleasing men; and a
clear proof is, that I am Christ's ser-
vant, whose service is incompatible
with that of man.' The emphasis thus
rests on ἐτι (Mey., Brown) which is
not merely logical (De Wette), but
temporal, with ref. to the preceding
δέτι. Rec. and Tisch. (ed. 7) insert
γάρ after ετι, with D³EKL; Syr.,
and other Vv.; Chrys., Theod. al.,—
but with little plausibility, as the
authority for the omission is strong
[ABD⁴FGN; 5 mss.; Vulg., Clarom.,
Copt., Arm.; Cyr. (3). Dam.], and
the probability of interpolation to
assist the argument is by no means
slight.

ἥμην] This form
of the imperf., so common in later
writers, is found, Xen. *Cyr.* VI. 1. 9,
Lysias, *Areop.* p. 111. 17 (ed. Steph.),
but is unequivocally condemned by
the Atticists. Buttm. remarks that
it is commonly found when in combi-
nation with δε' this however is doubt-
ful; see Lobeck, *Phryn.* p. 152.

11. Γνωρίζω δέ] 'Now I certify,
make known unto you,' commence-

γελιον τὸ εὐαγγελισθὲν ὑπ' ἐμοῦ, ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν κατὰ
12 ἀνθρωπον· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐγὼ παρὰ ἀνθρώπου παρέλαβον

Griesb., Scholz., Lachm., *De W., Mey., Tisch.* ed. 7). For γὰρ, BD¹FG; 17. al....Vulg., Clarom., Dam., Hier., Aug., al. (*Tisch.* ed. 2; commended by Griesb.). The permutation of δὲ and γὰρ is so common that *internal* considerations become here of some importance. The question is, does St Paul here seem to desire to carry out further his previous remarks? to explain? or to prove them? In the first case we could only have, as Rück. observes, δέ in the second, γὰρ or δέ (δὲ retaining a faint oppositional force, Klotz, *Devar.* Vol. II. p. 3); in the third, only γὰρ. The context seems decisively in favour of the first hypothesis, and therefore of δέ.

ment of what may be termed the apologetic portion of the epistle, ch. i. 11—ii. 21. The present formula, Usteri observes, is always used by St Paul as the prelude of a more deliberate and solemn avowal of his opinion; comp. 1 Cor. xv. 1, 2 Cor. viii. 1, 1 Cor. xii. 3 (διὸ γν.). Δέ is consequently here (see critical note) what is termed μεταβατικόν, Bekk. *Anecd.* p. 958 (cited by Hartung, Vol. I. p. 165), i. e. it indicates a *transition* from what has been already said, to the fresh aspects of the subject which are now introduced.

For examples of the very intelligible attraction τὸ εὐαγγελίσθαι, see Winer, *Gr.* § 66. 5, p. 551.

οὐκ ἕστιν κατὰ ἀνθρώπουν] ‘is not after man,’ i. e. ‘is of no human strain;’ κατὰ complectitur vim prepositionum ἀπό (?) , διὰ et παρό.’ Bengel. This remark, if understood exegetically rather than grammatically, is perfectly correct. Κατὰ ἀπό, taken *per se* implies, ‘after the fashion, after the manner of man’ (Winer, *Gr.* § 49. d, p. 358), but in the present context amounts to the more comprehensive declaration that the εὐαγγελισθεὶς was not ἀνθρώπουν, either in its essence or object; οὐχ ὑπὸ ἀνθρώπουν σύγκειται λογισμῶν. Theod.: compare Plato, *Phileb.* p. 120, τὸ δὲ ἐμὸν δεδούσθη οὐκ ἔστι κατὰ ἀνθρώ-

πον where the true qualitative nature of the expression is shown by the further explanation δλλὰ τέρα τοῦ μεγίστου φόβου. The different shades of meaning under which this formula appears in St Paul’s Epp. (ch. iii. 15, Rom. iii. 5, 1 Cor. iii. 3, ix. 8, xv. 32) must be referred to the context, not to the preposition; see Fritz, *Rom.* iii. 5, Vol. I. p. 159 sq.; and comp. Suicer, *Thesaur.* Vol. I. p. 351.

12. οὐδὲ γὰρ ηγέ] ‘For neither did I receive it, &c.’ proof of the preceding assertion. The true force of οὐδὲ has here been frequently misunderstood; but may be properly preserved, if we only observe (1) that in all such cases as the present (comp. John v. 22, viii. 42, Rom. viii. 7) the particle must receive its *exact* explanation from the context (‘adsumptā extrinsecus aliquā sententia,’ Klotz, *Devar.* Vol. II. p. 707); and (2) that οὐδὲ γὰρ in negative sentences stands in strict parallelism, and bears corresponding meanings, with καὶ γὰρ in positive sentences; see Hartung, *Partik.* οὐδέ, 2. B. 2, Vol. I. p. 211, and comp. Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* s.v. Vol. II. p. 21 sq. We may thus correctly translate, either (a) *nam ne ego quidem*, ‘even I who so naturally might have been taught of men, Hilgenf., Winer in loc., and Gr.

αὐτὸς οὕτε ἐδιδάχθην, ἀλλὰ δι' ἀποκαλύψεως Ἰησοῦ

§ 55. 6, p. 436; or (β) *neque enim ego*, ‘I as little as the other Apostles’ (Olsh.); or perhaps a little more inclusively, ‘*I* (distinctly emphatic)—as little as any others, whether Χριστοδιδάκτοι or διθρωτοδιδάκτοι.’ Of these (β) is to be preferred not only from contextual but even grammatical reasons; for (α) independently of seeming too concessive, would also have been most naturally expressed by *οὐδὲ ἔγώ γάρ*, or *καὶ γάρ οὐδὲ ἔγώ* (Rück.). This last objection Meyer considers invalid on account of the normal position of *γάρ*,—but inexactly; for though *γάρ* generally occupies the 2nd place, yet when the 1st and 2nd words are closely united (which would here be the case) it occupies the 3rd: see Klotz, *Devar.* Vol. II. p. 251.

ταπά διθρέπουν] ‘from man.’ not synonymous with *ἀπὸ διθρών*, the distinction between these prepositions after verbs of receiving, &c. (*ταπά* more *immediate*, *ἀπό* more *remote source*) being appy. regularly maintained in St Paul’s Epp.: comp. I Cor. xi. 23, *ταρέλαθον* *ἀπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου* on which Winer (*de Verb. Comp. Fas.* II. p. 7) rightly observes, ‘non *ταπά τοῦ Κυρίου*, propterea quod non ipse Christus presentem docuit;’ see Schulz, *Abendm.* p. 218 sq.

οὐτε ἐδιδάχθην] ‘nor was I taught it,’ slightly different from the preceding *ταρέλαθον*, the ἐδιδ. pointing more to *subjective appropriation*, while *ταρέλ.* only marks *objective reception* (Windischm.); so appy. Beng., ‘alterum (*ταρέλ.*) fit *sine labore*, alterum *cum labore discendi*.’ On the sequence *οὐδὲ—οὐτε*, see Winer, *Gr.* § 55. 6, p. 436, and esp. Hartung, *Partik. οὐτε*, I. 9, Vol. I. p. 201 sq., where this unusual, but (in cases like the present) defensible, collocation is fully explain-

ed. In all such passages, δὲ refers to the foregoing words or sentence, so that οὐτε is used as if οὐ or οὐκ had preceded; δὲ in negative sentences having often much of the force and functions which καὶ has in affirmative sentences: see especially Wex, *Antig.* Vol. II. p. 157, and comp. Klotz, *Devar.* Vol. II. p. 711. The reading *οὐδὲ* (*Rec.* and even *Lachm.*) is supported by AD¹ FGN; a few mss.; Eus., Chrys., al.; but, as a likely repetition of the preceding οὐδὲ, or a correction of a supposed solecism, is more than doubtful.

‘*Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ*] ‘from Jesus Christ;’ gen. *subjecti*, forming an antithesis to the preceding *ταπά διθρών*. Christ was the *source* and author of it (Fell, Hamm.): comp. 2 Cor. xii. 1, and notes on 1 *Thess.* i. 6. In expressions similar to the present (comp. *εἰρήνη Θεοῦ*, *εὐαγγ. τοῦ Χριστοῦ*) it is only from the context that the nature of the gen., whether *subjecti* or *objecti*, can be properly determined; see Winer, *Gr.* § 30. 1, p. 168, and comp. notes on ver. 7. The peculiar revelation here alluded to may be, as Aquinas supposes, one vouchsafed to the Apostle soon after his conversion, by which he was fitted to become a preacher of the Gospel; comp. Eph. iii. 3, where however *ἔγωποθη* (*Lachm.*, *Tisch.*) is less decisive than *Rec.* *ἔγωρισε*.

It is a subject of continual discussion whether the teaching of St Paul was the result of one single illumination, or of progressive development; comp. Reuss, *Théol. Chrét.* IV. 4, Vol. II. p. 42 sq.; Thiersch, *Apost. Age*, Vol. I. p. 110 sq. (Transl.). The most natural opinion would certainly seem to be this; that as, on the one hand, we may reverently presume that all the fundamental truths of the Gospel would be *fully*

13 Χριστοῦ. ἡκούσατε γὰρ τὴν ἐμὴν ἀναστροφήν ποτε
ἐν τῷ Ἰουδαϊσμῷ, ὅτι καθ' ὑπερβολὴν ἐδίωκον τὴν
14 ἔκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ ἐπόρθουν αὐτήν καὶ προέκο-
πτον ἐν τῷ Ἰουδαϊσμῷ ὑπὲρ πολλοὺς συνηλικιώτας ἐν τῷ

revealed to St Paul before he commenced preaching; so, on the other, it might have been ordained, that (in accordance with the laws of our spiritual nature) its deepest mysteries and profoundest harmonies should be seen and felt through the practical experiences of his apostolical labours. The question is partially entertained by Augustine, *de Gestis Pelag.* ch. XIV. (32), Vol. I. p. 339 sq. (ed. Migne, Par. 1845).

13. ἡκούσατε γάρ] ‘For ye heard;’ historical proof, by an appeal to his former well known (ἡκούσ. emphatic) zeal for Judaism, that it was no human influence or human teaching that could have changed such a character; οὐ γὰρ ἦν, εἰ μὴ Θεὸς ἦν δὲ ἔκκαλύπτων, οὕτως διθρόνας ἕσχον μεταβολὴν. Chrys. τὴν ἐμὴν ἀναστροφήν ποτε κ.τ.λ.] ‘my conversation in time past,’ &c. Auth.-Vers. These words are taken by most interpreters as simply equivalent to τὴν ποτε (προτέραν) ἀναστροφήν ποτε. This is not critically exact. As Dr Donaldson has suggested, the position of ποτε is due to the verb included in ἀναστροφήν as St Paul would have said ἀνεστρεψόμην ποτε, he allows himself to write τὴν ἐμὴν ἀναστροφήν ποτε. Meyer aptly cites Plato, *Leg.* III. p. 685 D, ἡ τῆς Τρολας ἀλωσις τὸ δεύτερον. ἐν τῷ Ἰουδαϊσμῷ] ‘the Jews’ religion,’ i.e. ‘Judaism;’ see 2 Macc. ii. 21, XIV. 38, 4 Macc. iv. 26. On the specializing force of the art. with abstract nouns, see Scheuerlein, *Syntax*, § 26. 2. c, p. 219. ἐπόρθουν] ‘was destroying it,’ ‘expugnabam,’ Vulg., Clarom.: see Acts ix.

21, δὲ πορθήσας ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ τοὺς ἐπικαλούμενους: and comp. Aesch. *Sept.*

176 (194). It is not necessary either to modify the meaning of πορθεῖν with

Syr. (Διόστι Στάθμον eram vastans),

Copt. (desolabam), and other Vv., or to explain the imperf. as *de conatu* (σθέσαι ἐπεχειρεῖν Chrys.) with the Greek commentators. As Meyer justly observes, St Paul previous to his conversion was actually engaged in the work of *destruction*: he was not a *Verrüster* merely, or a *Verstößer*, but a *Zerstörer*: comp. Acts xxii. 4, ἐδίωξα δχρι θανάτου. The imperfects accurately denote the course of the Apostle’s conduct, which commenced and continued during the time of his Judaism, but owing to his conversion was never carried out; contrast ἐδίωξα, Acts, l. c., 1 Cor. xv. 9; and see Bernhardy, *Synt.* x. 3, p. 372 sq., where the three principal uses of the imperf. (simultaneity, duration, and *non-completion*) are perspicuously stated, and comp. the more elaborate notice of Schmalfeld, *Synt.* § 55, pp. 97—III.

14. συνηλικώτας] ‘contemporaries.’ Συνηλ. is a διτάξ λεγόμ. in the N. T., and is only found occasionally in a few later writers, e.g. Diod. Sic. I. 53, Dion. Halic. x. 49; see Wetst. in loc., and the exx. collected by Dindorf and Hase in Steph. *Thesaur.* s. v. Vol. VII. p. 1378. The compound form (compare συμμέτοχος, Eph. iii. 6, v. 7; συγκοινών, 1 Cor. ix. 23) is condemned by the Atticists; Attic writers using only the simple form; see Thomas Mag. p. 208 (ed. Bern.).

γένει μου, περιστοτέρως ζηλωτής ὑπάρχων τῶν πατρικῶν μου παραδόσεων.

I will confirm this by a recital of the places where I abide, and the σας με ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός μου καὶ countries in which I travelled. The churches of Judea knew of me only by report.

"Οτε δὲ εὐδόκησεν ὁ Θεός, ὁ ἀφορί-

15. ὁ Θεός] ADEKLN; mss.; many Vv., but Syr. (Philox.) with ast.; Orig. (1), Chrys. (1), Theod. (3), al.; Iren. (1), Aug., al. (*Rec., Griesb.* marked with ∞ , Scholz, [Lachm.] Mey.). *Tisch.* omits these words with BFG; some mss.; Boern., Vulg., Syr.; Orig. (2), Chrys. (1), Theodoret (2), Iren. (1), Orig. (interp.), Faust. ap. Aug., Ambrst., Hier., al. (*De W.*, approved by Mill, Prolegom. p. 47). The accidental omission however seems probable on diplomatic considerations (see Pref. p. xvi), Θ having O immediately before, and soon after it.

Herodian, p. 433 (ed. Koch.).

περιστοτ. [ζηλωτής ὑπάρχ.] 'being from the first more exceedingly a zealot or contender,' modal participle clause serving to define more particularly the peculiar nature of the advance which St Paul made in Judaism. The comparison περιστ. is obviously with those just mentioned, the πολλοὶ συνηλ. ἐν τῷ γένει μου. τῶν πατρικῶν μου παραδόσεων] 'for the traditions of my fathers;' gen. object after ζηλωτής,—object about which the ζῆλος was displayed; comp. Acts xxi. 20, xxii. 3, 1 Cor. xiv. 12, Tit. ii. 14. The insertion of *μου* qualifies the more general term παραδόσεις, making it equivalent to the more special πατροπαρδότος, and thus certainly seeming here to limit the παραδόσεις to the special ancestral traditions of the sect to which the Apostle belonged (Meyer), i.e. to *Pharisaical* traditions; comp. Acts xxiii. 6, Φαρισαῖος πλὸς Φαρισαῖων and more expressly Acts xxvi. 5, κατὰ τὴν ἀκριβεστάτην αἵρεσιν τῆς ἡμετέρας θρησκείας ἔγνα Φαρισαῖος.

15. "Οτε δὲ εὐδόκ. κ.τ.λ.] 'But when it pleased God,' notice of the time subsequent to his conversion, in which

the Apostle might have been thought to have conferred with men, but did not. On the meaning of εὐδοκέω,—here marking the free, unconditioned, and gracious will of God, see notes on 1 *Thess.* ii. 8, and on its four constructions in the N. T., notes on *Col.* i. 19. ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός μου] 'from my mother's womb,' i.e. 'from the moment I was born,'—not as Calv., 'nondum genitum,' Jer. i. 5; ἐκ being temporal both here and Matth. xix. 12, Luke i. 15, Acts iii. 2, xiv. 8, and marking the point of time from which the temporal series is reckoned: see Winer, *Gr.* § 47. b, p. 328.

The verb ἀφορίας, as Jowett observes, has two meanings, the first physical (Æth.-Pol.), the second and predominant one ethical and spiritual ('segregavit,' Vulg., Clarom.); comp. Rom. i. 1. καὶ καλέσας κ.τ.λ.]

'and called me by means of His grace,' scil. at the Apostle's conversion (Acts ix. 3 sq.),—not with any reference to a calling, undefined in time, which depended on the counsels of God, as Rückert in loc.: compare Rom. viii. 30, where the temporal connexion between προώρισε and ἐκδ-

16 καλέσας διὰ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ, ἀποκαλύψαι τὸν νιὸν αὐτοῦ ἐν ἐμοί, ἵνα εὐαγγελίζωμαι αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, εὑθέως οὐ προσανεθέμην σαρκὶ καὶ

λεσσε (on the force of the aorists see Fritz. *in loc.*) is exactly similar to that between *ἀφορτας* and *καλέσας* in the present passage. The *κλήσις* in both cases has a distinct origin in time; *ἀπὸ* [Θεό] ἐφη καὶ πρὸ αἰώνων προεγκένται καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα κεκληκέται καθ' ὅτι καὶ τὸν ἐδοκίμασεν Theod.; comp. Usteri, *Lehrb.* II. 2. 2, p. 269. θιὰ τῆς χάρ. αὐτοῦ] ‘by means of His grace.’ grace was the ‘causa mediana’ of the Apostle’s call; *ταυτοχοῦ τῆς χάριτος εἶναι φησι τὸ πῶν καὶ τῆς φιλανθρωπίας αὐτοῦ τῆς ἀφάσιον.* Chrys. The moving cause of the call was the Divine *εἴδοκλία*, the mediating cause the boundless grace of God, the instrument the heaven-sent voice: comp. Winer, *Gr.* § 47, p. 337.

16. *ἀποκαλύψαι*] ‘To reveal,’ dependent on the preceding *εἴδοκλία*, not on the participles (*Est.*),—a connexion that would involve the unexampled construction (in the N. T.) *εἴδοκλος*.—*ἵνα εὐαγγ.*, and would impair the force of *ἴνα*. ἐν ἐμοὶ] ‘within me,’ not ‘per me,’ Grot., ‘in my case,’ Green, or ‘coram me,’ Peile; but simply ‘in me,’ Vulg., i.e. ‘in my soul;’ *Χριστὸς εἰχεν ἐν ἑαυτῷ λαλοῦτα.* Chrys. It may be admitted that, owing partly to linguistic (see on *2 Thess.* ii. 16), and partly to dogmatical reasons (Winer, *Gr.* § 47. 2. obs., p. 322), there is some difficulty in satisfactorily adjusting all St Paul’s varied uses of the prep. *ἐν*. still, wherever the primary meaning gives a sense which cannot be objected to dogmatically or exegetically, we are bound to abide by it. Here this meaning is especially pertinent. Both

subjectively, by deep inward revelations, as well as *objectively*, by outward manifestations, was the great apostle prepared for the work of the ministry; see Chrysost. *in loc.*

On the arbitrary meanings assigned to *ἐν* in the N. T., see Winer, *Gr.* § 48. a, p. 348. εὐαγγελίζωμαι] Present: the action was still going on.

εὐθέως οὐ προσανεθέμην] ‘straightway I addressed &c.’ the *εὐθέως* standing prominently forward and implying that he not only avoided conference with men, but did so from the *very first*: οὐκ εἴπει ἀπλῶς, ‘οὐ προσανεθέμην,’ δλλ’ ‘εὐθέως κ.τ.λ.’ Chrys. According to the common explanation, *εὐθέως* is to be connected in sense with *ἀπῆλθος*, though in immediate structure with *προσανεθέμην*. ‘Apostolus,—quis fuit ejus alacritas,—interponit negativam sententiam quae ipsi in mentem venit;’ Winer; comp. Jowett, and Alf. It seems more correct to say that *εὐθέως* belongs to the whole sentence from *οὐ προσαν.* to ‘*Ἄραβας*, which, by means of the antithesis between its component negative and affirmative clauses, in fact expresses one single thought; ‘immediately I avoided all conference and intercourse with man;’ comp. Meyer *in loc.*

οὐ προσανεθέμην] ‘I addressed no communication to;’ not exactly ‘non acquevi,’ Vulg., Clarom., nor quite so much as Δεῦτε μή [non revelavi] Syr., but more simply, οὐκ ἀνέκουσσαμην, Theod., ‘I made no communication to, and held no counsel with,’ ‘non contuli.’ Beza. The prep. *πρὸς* does not imply that the Apostle ‘did

αῖματι, οὐδὲ ἀπῆλθον εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα πρὸς τοὺς πρὸ 17
έμου ἀποστόλους, ἀλλὰ ἀπῆλθον εἰς Ἀραβίαν, καὶ

not in addition to that confer' (comp. Ust.), but, as not uncommonly in composition, simply indicates direction towards: compare προσαντίθεσθαι τοῖς μάντραις (Diod. Sic. xvii. 16) with προσανφέρειν τοῖς μάντραις (ib. ib.), in which latter verb the idea of direction is made more apparent; see Fritz. Fritsch. *Opusc.* p. 204. σαρκὶ καὶ αἵματι] 'flesh and blood;' a Hebrew circumlocution for man,—generally with the accessory idea of *weakness* or *frailty*; see Hammond and Lightfoot on *Matt.* xvi. 17. The expression occurs four times in the N. T., apparently under the following modifications of meaning; (a) Man in his mere corporeal nature, 1 Cor. xv. 50, Heb. ii. 14; (b) Man in his weak intellectual nature, contrasted with God, Matt. xvi. 17 (contr. Mey.), comp. Chrys. Vol. x. 675 E, ed. Ben.; (c) Man in his feeble human powers, contrasted with spiritual natures and agencies, Eph. vi. 11. The present passage seems to belong to (b); the Apostle took not weak men for his advisers or instructors, but communed in stillness with God. Chrys. in referring the words to the Apostles seemed himself to feel the application too limited, as he adds, εἰ δὲ καὶ περὶ πάντων ἀνθρώπων τοῦτο φησι, οὐδὲ ἡμεῖς ἀντεροῦμεν.

17. οὐδὲ ἀπῆλθον] 'nor did I go away,' scil. from Damascus,—to which place the mention of his conversion naturally leads his thoughts. It does not here seem necessary to press οὐδὲ in translation ('nor yet did I, &c.' Conyb.), as the context does not seem climactic; see notes on 1 *Thess.* ii. 3 (*Transl.*). In the present case it has appy. only that *quasi* conjunctive force (see notes ver. 12) by which it

appends one negation to another,—'non apte connexa, sed potius fortuito concursu accendentia;' Klotz, *Devar.* Vol. II. p. 707; see notes on *Eph.* iv. 27, Winer, *Gr.* § 55. 6, p. 432, and esp. Franke, *de Part. Neg.* II. 2, p. 6.

The reading ἀπῆλθον [Rec. with AKLN; ms.; Vulg., Clarom., Copt., Syr.-Philox.; Chrys., Theod.], though recently adopted by Tisch. (ed. 7) and fairly supported, is inferior in critical authority to ἀπῆλθον, and to be suspected as a not improbable correction.

δλλά] The particle has here its usual force after a negation, and implies such an opposition between the negative and affirmative clauses, that the first is as it were obliterated and absorbed by the second; see Klotz, *Devar.* Vol. II. p. 11, Fitz. *Mark*, Excurs. 2, p. 773. Schrader is thus perhaps justified in pressing the opposition between οὐ προσαν. and δλλά ἀπῆλθ. as an evidence that St Paul went into Arabia for *seclusion*; contr. Anger, *Rat. Temp.* ch. IV. p. 123. In estimating however the force of δλλά in negative sentences, caution must always be used, as οὐκ—δλλά (not δὲ) is the *regular* sequence, like 'nicht—sondern' (not 'aber') in German; see Donalds. *Cratyl.* § 201.

εἰς Ἀραβίαν] 'into Arabia;' possibly the Arabian desert in the neighbourhood of Damascus, Ἀραβία being a term of somewhat vague and comprehensive application; see Conyb. and Hows. *St Paul*, Vol. I. p. 105, and for the various divisions of Arabia, Forbiger, *Alt. Geogr.* § 102, Vol. II. p. 728 sq. This brief but circumstantial recapitulation of St Paul's early history is designed to show that, in the early period after his conver-

18 πάλιν ὑπέστρεψα εἰς Δαμασκόν. ἐπειτα μετὰ ἔτη τρία ἀνῆλθον εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα ἵστορησαι Κηφᾶν, καὶ

sion, he was never in any place where he could have learned anything from the other Apostles. A discussion of the *object* (probably religious meditation) and of the *duration* (probably a large portion of three years) of this abode in Arabia,—both, especially the latter, greatly contested points, will be found in Schrader, *Paulus*, Part I. p. 54 sq.; Wieseler, *Chronol.* p. 141 sq.; Davidson, *Introd.* Vol. II. p. 75, 80.

[Δαμασκόν]

'Damascus.' This most ancient city certainly existed as early as the days of Abraham (Gen. xiv. 15, xv. 2), and is supposed even at that remote period to have had an independent government (see L. Müller, *Orig. Regni Damasc.* in Iken, *Thesaur.* Vol. I. p. 721 sq.). After being subdued by David (2 Sam. viii. 5, 6), it revolted under Solomon (1 Kings xi. 24), formed the seat of a very widely extended government (comp. 1 Kings xx. 1), was recovered by Jeroboam the son of Joash (2 Kings xiv. 28), united in alliance with the kingdom of Israel, but was afterwards taken by Tiglath Pileser (2 Kings xvi. 9). After falling successively under the Babylonian, Persian, and Seleucid sway, it passed at last under that of the Romans (B.C. 64; see Diod. Sic. XXXIX. 30), and at the time of the Apostle formed a part of the dependent kingdom of Aretas (2 Cor. xi. 32). For further notices of the history of this ancient city, see Winer, *RWB.* Vol. I. p. 244 sq.; Pauly, *Real-Encycl.* Vol. II. p. 847 sq.; Conyb. and Howson, *St Paul*, Vol. I. p. 105.

18. Ἐτη τρία] 'three years,' scil. after his conversion, that being the obvious and natural *terminus a quo* to which all the dates in the narrative

are to be referred; see notes on ch. ii. 1. How much of this time was spent in Damascus, and how much in Arabia, is completely uncertain. The only note of time in Acts ix. 23, ημέρας ἴκαναι, which appears to include this stay in Arabia, has by recent expositors been referred solely to the time of preaching at Damascus,—though appy. with less probability; see Anger, *Rat. Temp.* p. 122; Wieseler, *Chronol.* p. 143.

Ιστορήσαι] 'to visit, to become acquainted with;' scarcely so little as 'videre,' Vulg., Syr., Copt., al., but more in the sense of 'coram cognoscere,'—to visit and make a personal acquaintance with. As the meaning of this verb has been somewhat contested, we may remark that it is used by later writers with reference to (a) *places, things*,—in the sense of 'visiting,' 'making a journey to see'; Plutarch, *Thes.* 30, *Pomp.* 40; Polyb. *Hist.* III. 48. 12; compare Chrysost. διερ οὐδὲ μεγάλας τόλεις καὶ λαμπρὰς καταμανθάνοντες λέγουσιν. (b) *persons*—in the sense of 'seeing,' 'making the acquaintance of'; Joseph. *Antiq.* VIII. 2. 5, *ἰστορῆσαι Ἐλεδαρῶν Bell.* VI. I. 8, δν ἐγώ *ἰστόρησα*· somewhat curiously, in reference to the pillar of salt into which Lot's wife was changed, *Antiq.* I. 22, *ἰστόρηκα δὲ αὐτὴν*· see also Clem. *Hom.* VIII. 24 (p. 196, ed. Dressel), *ἰστορῆσαι τὸν τῆς θεραπείας ἐπιτυγχάνοντας*; ib. I. 9, p. 32; XIX. 6, p. 376; and exx. collected by Hilgenf. *Gal.* p. 122, note. There is thus no lexical necessity for pressing the primary meaning (Hesych. *ἰστορεῖ, ἐρωτᾷ*) advocated by Bagge in loc. The reading Ηέρπων (*Rec.*), instead of Κηφᾶν [ABN; 3 mss.; Syr., Copt., Εθ. (both), Syr.-Phil. in marg., al.], is

ἐπέμεινα πρὸς αὐτὸν ἡμέρας δεκαπέντε· ἔτερον δὲ 19
τῶν ἀποστόλων οὐκ εἶδον εἰ μὴ Ἰάκωβον τὸν ἀδελ-

supported by preponderating external authority [DEFGKL; mss.; Vulg., Clarom., al.; many Ff.], but is rightly rejected by most modern editors as a probable explanatory gloss.

ἔπέμενα πρὸς αὐτὸν] ‘*I tarried with him;*’ comp. ch. ii. 5, διαμεληπτὸν πρὸς ὑμᾶς· Matth. xxvi. 55, πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐκαθεζόμενός (*Lachm.*) ; i Cor. xvi. 6, πρὸς ὑμᾶς δὲ τυχόν παραμενών ver. 7, ἔπέμενα πρὸς ὑμᾶς· al.: usually with persons; ‘*sæpe nostri scriptores, ut ipsorum Græcorum poëtæ passim, πρὸς* cum accus., adjecto verbo quietis, sic collocant, ut non sit nisi *apud*, i. q. παρὰ cum dativo.’ Fritz. on *Mark*, p. 202. We may compare with this the legal forms, πρὸς διαιτητὴν λαχεῖν, Demosth. p. 602. § 36; τὰ δίκας εἶναι πρὸς τὸν δρόσωτας, ib. 1074. § 95; &c. where the original notion of ‘going to,’ &c. has passed into that of mere direction. The *dw̄l* in *ἔπέμενα* is not *per se* ‘intensive’ (Alf. on *Col.* i. 23), but appy. denotes *rest* at a place; see Rost u. Palm, *Lex.* s. v. *ἔπι*, C. 3, Vol. I. p. 1045. The verb itself has two constructions in the N.T.—with a simple dative (Rom. vi. 1, xi. 22, 23, Col. i. 23, i Tim. iv. 16); and with prepp. *ἐπὶ* (Acts xxviii. 14), πρὸς (here, and i Cor. xvi. 7), *ἐν* (Phil. i. 24); see notes on *Col.* i. 23, and Winer, *Verb. Comp.* II. p. 11.

ἡμέρας δεκαπέντε] The reason for this *shortness* of St Paul’s stay is mentioned in *Acts ix. 29*. The Apostle specifies the exact time of his stay at Jerusalem, to show convincingly how very slight had been his opportunities of receiving instruction from St Peter or any one else there.

19. εἰ μὴ Ἰάκωβον] ‘*save James*,’ i.e. no other *ἀπόστολος* save him. It may fairly be said that every prin-

ciple of grammatical perspicuity requires that after these words not merely *εἴδον*, but *εἴδον τὸν ἀπόστολον* be supplied; comp. i Cor. i. 14, οὐδέποτε ἦμῶν εἴδαπτον εἰ μὴ Κριόνων καὶ Γδίον. This is distinctly admitted both by Mey., Hilgenf., and the best recent commentators, even though they differ in their deductions: so very clearly Chrys. St James then was an *ἀπόστολος* (whatever be the meaning assigned to the word),—a fact somewhat confirmed by the use of *ἀπόστόλους*, *Acts ix. 27*. The additional title, δὲ ἀδελφὸς τοῦ Κυρίου (*τὸ σεμνολόγημα*, as Chrys. terms it), was probably added (Ust.) to distinguish this James from the son of Zebedee, who was then living. Whether it follows from this passage that *Jacobus Frater* and *Jacobus Alphæi* are identical (*by no means* such a fiction as Meyer somewhat hastily terms it), and that James was thus one of the Twelve, is a question which falls without the scope of this commentary. This consideration only may be suggested; whether in a passage so circumstantial as the present, where St Paul’s whole object is to prove that he was no emissary from the *Ἄποστολοι* (comp. ver. 17), the use of *ἀδελφὸς* in its less proper sense (*Κυρίου ἀνεψιός*, Theod.) is not more plausible than the similar use of *ἀπόστολος*. The most weighty counter-argument is derived from John vii. 5, οὐδὲ γάρ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ ἐπίστευον εἰς αὐτὸν: but it deserves careful consideration whether *ἐπίστευον* really means more than a proper, intelligent, and rightful belief; see even De Wette on *John* l. c., and comp. John vi. 64, where οὐ πιστεύειν is predicated of some of the *μαθηταί*, and where ver. 67 implies some doubt

20 φὸν τοῦ Κυρίου. ἀ δὲ γράφω ὑμῖν; ἵδον ἐνώπιον
21 τοῦ Θεοῦ ὅτι οὐ ψεύδομαι. ἔπειτα ἥλθον εἰς τὰ
22 κλίματα τῆς Συρίας καὶ τῆς Κιλικίας. ἦμην δὲ ἀγνοού-

even of οἱ δώδεκα. See also *Life of Our Lord*, p. 97, note. The student who desires to examine this difficult question may profitably consult Mill, *on the Brethren of our Lord*; Schneckenburger, *on St James*, p. 144 sq.; Arnaud, *Recherches sur l'Epître de Jude*, and the review of it by Dietlein in Reuter, *Repert.* (Aug. 1851); Neander, *Planting*, Vol. I. p. 351, note (Bohn); Blom's *Disputation* (in Vobedig, *Thesaur. Comment.* Vol. I.); Credner, *Einleitung*, Vol. I. p. 571; Wieseler, *Stud. u. Krit.* (Part I. 1842); and Hilgenf. *Galaterbr.* p. 219. The most recent monographs are those by Schaff, Berlin, 1842; and Goy, Mont. 1845.

20. **ἀ δὲ γράφω κ.τ.λ.]** ‘But as to what I write unto you,’ not parenthetical, but a strong and reiterated assurance of the little he had received from the Apostles, **ἀ δὲ γράφω ὑμῶν** being an emphatic anacoluthon: comp. Wannowski, *Constr. Abs.* p. 54 sq., where this and similar constructions are fully discussed. **ὅτι οὐ ψεύδομαι]** ‘(I declare) that I lie not,’ strong confirmatory asseveration of the truth,—not of ver. 12 sq. (Winer), but of ver. 17, 18. In passages marked with this sort of abruptness and pathos (see Lücke *on 1 Joh.* iii. 20, p. 245, ed. 2) a verb consonant with the context is commonly to be supplied before **ὅτι**, comp. Acts xiv. 22. Accordingly in the present case, **γράψω** (Mey.), **λέγω** (De W.), **ἔστι** (Rück.), **δημοσίη** (Ust.), have been proposed as suppletory; the first three are, however, obviously too weak, the last too strong,—**ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ** not being any more than **ὴλθον**, a formal

oath (Olsh.). If any definite word was in the Apostle's thoughts, it was perhaps **διαμαρτύρομαι** (Acts x. 42, with **ὅτι**), especially as, in three out of the five places in St Paul's Epp. in which **ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ** occurs in a similar sort of connexion to the present, this verb is found joined with it; see 1 Tim. v. 21, 2 Tim. ii. 14 (**ἐνώπιον τοῦ Κυρίου**), iv. 1. On this use of **ὅτι** in asseverations, see Fritz. *on Rom.* ix. 2, Vol. II. p. 242.

21. **τὰ κλίματα]** ‘the regions,’ ‘partes,’ Vulg.; a word only used in the N.T. by St Paul, here, Rom. xv. 23, and 2 Cor. xi. 10. The primary meaning, as derivation indicates, is ‘inclination’ or ‘declivitas,’ e.g. **κλίματα ὁρῶν**, Eustath. p. 1498. 47 (comp. Polyb. *Hist.* VII. 6. 1), thence with ref. to the inclination of the heavens to the poles, ‘a tract of the sky,’ **κλίμα οὐρανοῦ**, Herodian, XI. 8, and lastly,—its most usual meaning,—a tract of the earth, whether of greater (comp. Athen. XII. p. 523 E) or, as in the present case, of more limited extent: comp. Polyb. *Hist.* V. 44. 6, X. 1. 3. On its accentuation (usually **κλίμα**, but more correctly **κλίμα**) see Lobeck, *Paralip.* p. 418. The journey here mentioned is appy. identical with that briefly noticed in Acts ix. 30; see Conyb. and Hows. *St Paul*, Vol. I. p. 115.

Συρίας] Not the lower part of Syria, called Phoenice (Winer, Ust., al.), but ‘Syria proper’ (**ἡ δω Συρία**, Strabo), as St Paul's object is to show the *distance* he was from any quarter where he could have received instruction from the Apostles; see Meyer *in loc.* In Acts xxi. 3, **Συρία** is used merely

μενος τῷ προσώπῳ ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῆς Ἰουδαίας ταῖς
ἐν Χριστῷ, μόνον δὲ ἀκούοντες ἡσαν ὅτι ὁ διώκων 23

in a general way to denote the Roman province bearing that name: on its divisions, see Forbiger, *Handb. Geogr.* Vol. II. p. 640. *τῆς Κιλικίας*] Occasionally mentioned in combination with Συρία (Acts xv. 23, 41), 'from their geographical affinity' (Alf.), and as serving to define what portion of the larger province is especially alluded to. For a general notice of this province, see Strabo, *Geogr.* XIV. 5, p. 668 sq.; Mannert, *Geogr.* VI. 2, p. 32 sq.; Forbiger, *Alt. Geogr.* § 67, Vol. II. p. 271 sq.

22. *τῷ προσώπῳ*] 'in respect of personal appearance,' scil. 'by face,' οὐδὲ ἀνὴρ ὑψεως γνώμονος ἦν αὐτῷ. Chrys. The general limiting nature of the dative (Scheuerl. *Synt.* § 20, Donalds. *Gr.* § 458) may here be fully recognised: the Apostle was not unknown to the Churches in every sense, but only in regard to his outward appearance. This particular dative, commonly called the dative 'of reference to,' must be carefully distinguished both from the instrumental and the modal dat. (1 Cor. xi. 5), and may be best considered as a local dative ethically used. Here, for instance, the Apostle's appearance was not that by which, but as it were the place in which, their ignorance was evinced: see esp. Scheuerl. *Synt.* § 22, a, p. 179; and comp. Winer, *Gr.* § 31. 6, p. 193; Bernhardy, *Synt.* III. 8, p. 84.

τῆς Ἰουδαίας] The Church of Jerusalem however is to be excepted, as there the Apostle was εἰστορεύμενος καὶ ἐκτορεύμενος, παρθηταζόμενος ἐν τῷ δέματι τοῦ Κυρίου. Acts ix. 28.

ταῖς ἐν Χριστῷ] Not merely a periphrasis for the adj., 'the Christian churches,' but 'the churches which are

in Christ,' i.e. which are incorporated with Him who is the Head: comp. Eph. i. 22, 23.

23. *ἀκούοντες ἡσαν*] 'they were hearing,' scil. the members of these Churches; see Winer, *Gr.* § 67. 1, p. 555. This periphrasis, which probably owes its prevalence in the N. T. to the similar formula in Aramaic

(ΟΟΟΤΙ ~~אַלְמֹן~~), serves to express the idea of duration more distinctly than the simple tense; see Winer, *Gr.* § 45. 5, p. 311. In the LXX. it seems principally limited to those cases in which the participle is used in the original; see Thiersch, *de Pent.* III. 11, p. 113. Examples are found in Attic Greek (see Jelf, *Gr.* § 375. 4), but commonly under the limitation that the participle expresses some property or quality inherent in the subject; see Stalbaum, *Plato, Rep.* vi. p. 492 A.

ὅτι ὁ διάκονος κ.τ.λ.] 'our former persecutor;' the participle being here by means of the art. turned into a species of subst., and losing all temporal force; see the exx. collected by Winer, *Gr.* § 57, p. 317, and comp. the very bold form *τὸν ἔαυτῆς ἔχοντα*, Plato, *Phaedr.* p. 244 E, cited by Bernhardy, *Synt.* VI. 22. obs. p. 316.

"Or: is here not the 'ὅτι' recitativum' (Schott),—a use of the particle not found in St Paul's Epp. except in citations from the O. T. (Mey.),—but preserves its usual relative force, the 'oratio indirecta' which it introduces passing afterwards into the 'oratio directa' in the pronoun. This latter assumption Mey. deems unnecessary, as St Paul, being now a Christian, might call himself 'our former persecutor.' This however seems forced

ἡμᾶς ποτὲ νῦν εὐαγγελίζεται τὴν πίστιν ἡν ποτε ἐπόρ-
24 θει· καὶ ἐδόξαζον ἐν ἐμοὶ τὸν Θεόν.

II. Ἐπειτα διὰ δεκατεσσάρων ἐτῶν When I went up to
Jerusalem, I communicated my Gospel both in public and private: I resisted
the false brethren, and was accredited by the Apostles.

and artificial. τὴν πίστιν] ‘the faith,’ objectively represented as a rule of life (De W.); comp. ch. iii. 23, 1 Tim. i. 19, iv. 1, al. In the Ecclesiastic writers *πίστις* is frequently used in the more distinctly objective sense, ‘the Christian doctrine,’ ‘doctrina fidem postulans’ (e.g. Ignat. Eph. § 16, ἐὰν πίστιν Θεοῦ ἐν κακῷ διδασκαλίᾳ φθείρῃ’ Concil. Laod. can. 46, πίστιν ἐκμαθάνειν’ see Suicer, *Thes.* s. v. *πίστις*, 2. a), but it seems very doubtful whether this sense ever occurs in the N. T. In Acts vi. 7, ὑπακόειν τῇ πίστει seems certainly very similar to ὑπακόειν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ, Rom. x. 16 (see Fritz. Vol. I. 17), but even there ‘the faith,’ as the inward and outward rule of life (see Meyer in loc.), yields a very satisfactory meaning. On the various uses of *πίστις*, see Usteri, *Lehrb.* II. I. 2, p. 91 sq.

24. ἐν ἐμοὶ] ‘in me,’ not ‘on account of me’ (Brown), or ‘for what he had done in me’ (Jowett); but simply ‘in me’ (Vulg., Claram.), ‘ut qui in me inveniissent celebrationis materiam;’ Winer in loc.: compare Exod. xiv. 4, ἐνδοξασθήσομαι ἐν Φαραὼ. God, as Windisch observes, was working in St Paul, and so was praised in him. The prep. in such cases as the present points to the object as being as it were the *sphere* in which (Eph. i. 17), or the *substratum* on which (1 Cor. vii. 14, see Winer, *Gr.* p. 345; comp. Andoc. de Myster. p. 33, ed. Schiller) the action takes place. The transition from this to the common usage of *ἐν* in the sense of ‘dependence on,’ is easy and obvious; see exx. in Rost u. Palm, *Lex.* s. v. A. 2. b, Vol. I. p. 909, and

comp. Bernhardy, *Synt.* v. 8. b, p. 210.

CHAPTER II. I. διὰ δεκατεσσάρων ἔτην] ‘after an interval of,’ ‘post,’ Vulg., Claram., Copt., Armen.; δεκατεσσάρων παρελθόντων ἐτῶν, Chrys.: comp. Acts xxiv. 17, δι' ἐτῶν πλειστῶν. The meaning of the prep. has here been unduly pressed to suit preconceived historical views. Διὰ, in its temporal sense, denotes an action enduring through and out of a period of time; and may thus be translated *during*, or *after*, according as the nature of the action makes the idea of duration through the whole of the period (Heb. ii. 15, διὰ παντὸς τοῦ ἡμέραν), or occurrence at the end of the period, most prominent. Thus διὰ πολλοῦ χρόνου σε ἐώρακα is correctly explained by Fritz. (*Fritzsch. Opusc.* p. 163, note), ‘longo temporis spatio decurso quod non vidi, te vidi:’ comp. Herm. on *Vig.* No. 377, b. This is the correct use of διὰ. There are however a few indisputable instances of a more lax use of the prep. in the N. T., to denote an action which took place *within*, not during the *whole* of a period: e.g. Acts v. 19, διὰ νυκτὸς δυοῖς, where both the tense and the occurrence preclude the possibility of its being ‘throughout the night’ (contr. Meyer); so also Acts xvi. 9: Acts xvii. 10 is perhaps doubtful; see Fritzsch. *Opusc.* p. 165; Winer, *Gr.* § 47. i. p. 337. Grammatical considerations then alone are not sufficient to justify Dr Peile’s paraphrase, ‘not till after;’ but on *exegetical* grounds it may be fairly urged that the mention

πάλιν ἀνέβην εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα μετὰ Βαρνάβα, συμπαραλαβὼν καὶ Τίτον ἀνέβην δὲ κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν, 2

of fourteen years, thus undefined by a terminus *ad quem*, as well as *a quo*, would be singularly at variance with the circumstantial nature of the narrative. With regard to the great historical difficulties in which the passage is involved, it can here only briefly be said; (1) The terminus *a quo* of the fourteen years, being purely a subjective epoch, does certainly seem that time which must have ever been present to the Apostle's thoughts,—the time of his *conversion* (Anger, Wieseler); especially as the *ετη τρια*, ch. i. 18, appear so reckoned. (2) Exegetical as well as grammatical (*πάλιν*) considerations seem to show that it was St Paul's *second* journey;—for how, when misconstruction was so possible, could it be passed over? and how can St Peter's conduct be explained? But (3) chronolog. arguments, based on historical coincidences, make it impossible to doubt that Ireneus (*Hær.* III. 13) and Theodoret (*in loc.*) are right in supposing this the journey mentioned *Acts xv.*, and therefore, according to St Luke's account, the *third*. In a commentary of this nature it is impossible to allude to the various efforts (even to the invalidation of an unquestionable text) to reconcile (2) and (3): it may be enough to say that both chronological and historical deductions seem so certain, that (2) must give way: see the sensible explanation and remarks of Thiersch, *Apost. Age*, Vol. I. p. 120 sq. (Transl.). A complete discussion will be found in the chronolog. works of Anger and Wieseler; Davidson, *Introd.* Vol. II. p. 112 sq.; Winer, *RWB.* Art. 'Paulus'; Conyb. and Howson, *St Paul*, ch. VII.: see also Meyer *in loc.*; Alford, Vol. II. *Prolegom.* p. 26.

συμπαραλαβὼν καὶ Τίτον] 'having taken with me also Titus,' the ascensive *καὶ* perhaps alluding to his being uncircumcised; comp. *Acta xv.* 2, Παῦλον καὶ Βαρνάβαν καὶ τινας ἄλλους ἐξ αὐτῶν. St Paul was now the principal person (*συμπαραλαβών*): at the preceding (second) visit Barnabas seems to have taken the lead: see Meyer in *loc.*

2. *dvéβην δὲ* 'I went up too;' δὲ having its 'vim exponendi' (Fritz. *in loc.*), or, as we might perhaps more exactly say, its *reiterative* force (Klotz, *Devar.* Vol. II. p. 361, Hartung, *Partik.* δὲ, 2. 7, Vol. I. p. 168), and repeating, not without a slight opposition, the preceding *dvéβην*. The native force of the particle may just be traced in the faint contrast arising from the explanation and introduction of fresh particulars.

κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν] 'by, scil. in accordance with, revelation,—not for my own purposes;' κατὰ as usual implying the rule, the 'normam agendi'; see Bernhardy, *Synt.* v. 20. b, p. 239, 241. Hermann's translation 'explanationis causa' must on exegetical, and *perhaps* even on grammatical grounds (see Fritsch. *Opusc.* p. 169), *certainly* be rejected. For (1) *dvokálypsi*s is never used in this lower sense either by St Paul or any other of the sacred writers; and (2) the current of the Apostle's argument is totally at variance with such an explanation. His object is here to show that his visit to Jerusalem was not to satisfy any doubts of his own, nor even any suggestions of his converts, but in obedience to the command of God. The objection, that the current translation would require *κατὰ των dvokálypsi*s (Herm.), may be neu-

καὶ ἀνεθέμην αὐτοῖς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ὃ κηρύσσω ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, κατ' ιδίαν δὲ τοῖς δοκοῦσιν, μή πως εἰς κενὸν

tralized by the observation that *κατὰ ἀποκλυψμόν* is in effect used nearly adverbially; see Eph. iii. 3.

ἀνεθέμην] ‘I communicated;’ ‘contulicūm illis,’ Vulg., Clarom., comp. Syr. [patefecit]; ‘enarravi,’ Fritz.; ‘ipsa collatio unam doctrinæ speciem exclusa omni varietate monstrabat.’ Beza.

The meaning assigned by Green (*Gramm. N. T.* p. 82) ‘to leave altogether in the hands of, or at the pleasure of another,’ is more than doubtful; in the only other place in the N. T. where the word occurs, Acts xxv. 1, τῷ βασιλεῖ ἀνέθετο τὰ κατὰ τὸν Παῦλον, the meaning seems to be clearly, as here, ‘communicated;’ see Fritz. *Opusc.* p. 169, and the exx. in Wetst. *in loc.*

αὐτοῖς]

‘to them,’ scil. to the inhabitants of Ιερουσαλύμα (ver. 1), or rather (as the sense obviously requires a certain limitation) to the Christians residing there,—‘Christianis gregariis’ (Fritz.), as opp. to τοῖς δοκοῦσιν, the Apostles; comp. Matth. xii. 15, Luke v. 17; and see Winer, *Gr.* § 22. 3. 1, p. 131; Bernhardy, *Synt.* VI. II. b, p. 288. The reference to the Apostles collectively (Schott, Olsh.), or to the Elders of the Church, is not by any means probable.

κατ' ίδιαν [δι] ‘but privately,’ i. e. in a private conference; comp. Mark iv. 34: the Apostle communicated his εὐαγγέλιον to the Christians at Jerusalem openly and unreservedly, but *κατ' ίδιαν* (between me and them,

بَشِّرْتُكُمْ, Syr.) entered probably more into its doctrinal aspects; comp. Theod. *in loc.* The meaning assigned to δὲ (‘I mean’) by Alf., who appy. denies any second and separate communication, seems

here very doubtful (see ver. 4); and that to *κατ' ίδιαν* (‘preferably,’ ‘specially’) by Olsh., distinctly untenable, as *κατ' ίδιαν* occurs 16 times in the N. T., and in all cases is used in a directly, or (as here) indirectly *local* sense; see Mark ix. 28, xiii. 3, Luke x. 23, &c. and comp. Neand. *Plant.* Vol. I. p. 104 (Bohn).

τοῖς δοκοῦσιν] ‘to those who were high in reputation,’ Scholef. *Hints*, p. 88; see Eurip. *Hec.* 292 (295)—where οἱ δοκοῦσιν is opp. to οἱ ἀδοξοῦσι—*and the exx.* collected by Kypke and Elsner, esp. Eur. *Troad.* 608, and Herodian, VI. 1, τοῖς δοκοῦσιν καὶ ἡλικιᾳ σεμνοτάτοις,—in all of which οἱ δοκ. appears simply equivalent to ἐτισημοι (Theod.). There is not then, as Olsh. conceives, any shade of blame or irony (Alf.) in the expression, but as Chrys. correctly observes, ‘τοῖς δοκοῦσι φέσι, μετὰ τῆς ἑαυτοῦ καὶ τὴν κοιτὴν ἀπάτω λέγων ψῆφον’ see *Œcum. in loc.*

μή πως εἰς κενὸν τρέχω, ή θραμον] ‘lest I might be running, or have (already) run in vain;’ i. e. ‘lest I might lose my past or present labour’ (Hammon.) by leaving others to deem that it was fruitless and unaccredited. This passage presents combined grammatical and exegetical difficulties, both of which must be briefly noticed. (a) *τρέχω*. By comparing the very similar passage 1 Thess. iii. 5, μήπως ἐτείρασε...καὶ εἰς κενὸν γένηται κ.τ.λ. it would certainly seem that *τρέχω* is pres. subj. (see Winer, *Gr.* § 56. 2, p. 448, where both passages are investigated); but there is a difficulty both in mood and tense. The former may be explained away by the observable tendency of the N. T. and later writers to lapse from the optat. into

τρέχω, η ἐδραμον. 'Αλλ' οὐδέ *Τίτος* ὁ σὺν ἐμοὶ, 3
"Ελλην ὡν, ἡναγκάσθη περιτμηθῆναι διὰ δὲ τοὺς παρ- 4

the subjunct. (Winer, § 41. b. I, p. 258; Green, *Gr.* p. 72); the latter, either by considering *τρέχω* a 'then-present,' opp. to *ἔδραμον* a 'then-past,' or as pointing to the continuance of the action. (β) μή *τις* then is not *num forte* (an opinion formerly held by Fr. tzache, and still by Green, p. 82, but well refuted by Dr Peile), but *ne forte*. (γ) *ἴδραμον* may be explained in two ways; either (with Fritz.) as an indic. after a non-realized, etc. hypoth. (*Herm. de Partic. dī. I. 10*, p. 54), —a structure at which, strange to say, Hilgenf. seems to stumble;—or indic. after μήτως (tearing lest), the change of mood implying that the event apprehended had now taken place; see Winer, *Gr.* § 56. 2, p. 446; comp. Scheuerl. *Synt.* § 34. a. 5, p. 364; Matth. *Gr.* § 520. 8. We have then two possible translations; (1) Pur. ose; *δεθέμην...μήτως ἔδραμον, I communicate!...that I might not perchance have run in vain* (as I should have done if I had not, &c.). (2) Apprehension; *δεθέμην...(φοβούμενος) μήτως ἔδραμον, I communicated...being apprehensive lest perchance I might really have, &c., the verb 'timendi' being idiomatically omitted;* see Gayler, *de Part. Neg.* p. 327; Schmalfeld, *Synt.* § 152. Of these (2) seems most in accordance with St Paul's style; see ch. iv. 11, and 1 Thess. iii. 5. To both translations however there are very grave objections; to (1) on logical, to (2) on exegetical grounds: to (1), because it was not on the communication or non-communication of his Gospel that St Paul's running in vain really hinged, but on the assent or dissent of the Apostles: to (2), because it is incredible that he who went up κατ' *dwo-*

κδλνψ could have felt any doubt about his own course. To escape these difficulties we must adopt one of two explanations (neither wholly free from objections): either we must refer the words *objectively* to the danger St Paul's converts might have run of being rejected by the Church if he had not communicated; or (which is most probable) *subjectively*, with the Greek commentators, *to the opinions of others*; *Ινα διδάξω τοὺς ταῦτα ὑποτείνωτας διε οὐκ εἰς κερδὸν τρέχω* Chrys.; see Hammond *in loc.* If others deemed St Paul's past and present course fruitless, it really must in that respect have amounted to a loss of past and present labour.

3. 'Αλλ' οὐδέ] 'But (distinctly to prove *a fortiori* that I had not run in vain) not even,—&c. The emphasis rests on *Τίτος*,—Titus, whom the Apostles might have required to be circumcised, even while in general terms they approved of St Paul's preaching. On this gradational force of *Δλλ'* οὐδέ ('at *ne—quidem*,' 'indican^t, silentio obliterat^t re leviori, afferi graviorem'), see Fritz. *in loc.* (*Opusc.* p. 178), and compare Luke xxiii. 15, Acts xix. 2. The true separative force of *Δλλὰ* ('aliud jam esse quod sumus dicturi,' Klotz, *Devar. Vol. II.* p. 2) is here distinctly apparent.


"Ελλην ὁν] 'being a Greek,' scil. 'inasmuch as, or though, he was a Greek,' κατοι 'Ελλην ὁν' Theodoret; not 'and was a Greek,' Alf., the appended participial clause not being predicative, but concessive, or suggestive of the reason why the demand was made; comp. Donalds. *Cratyl.* § 305, *Gr.* § 492 sq.

†*ἡναγκάσθη]* 'was compelled.' The choice of this word seems clearly to

εισάκτους ψευδαδέλφους, οἵτινες παρεισῆλθον κατασκοπῆσαι τὴν ἐλευθερίαν ἡμῶν ἦν ἔχομεν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ,

imply that the circumcision of Titus was strongly pressed on St Paul and St Barnabas; see Baur, *Paulus*, p. 121. It does not however by any means appear that the *Apostles* were party to it; in fact, if we assume the identity of this journey with the third, the language of Acts xv. 5 seems distinctly to imply the contrary.

4. Σὰδ δὲ τοὺς παρεισάκτους ψευδαδέλφους] ‘and that, or now it was, because of the false brethren insidiously brought in,’ scil. οὐκ ἡραγκάσθη περιτμηθῆναι’ explanatory statement (δὲ explicative; see below) why Titus was not compelled to be circumcised, viz. because the ψευδάδελφοι were making it a party matter. The construction is not perfectly perspicuous, but it does not appear necessary either to regard it as a positive anacoluthon (Rinck, *Lucubr. Crit.* p. 171, Hilgenf. *in loc.*); or as an anacol. arising from two blended constructions (Winer, *Gr.* § 63, p. 502); still less a connexion of ver. 4 with ver. 2 (Bagge, al.). The difficulty, as the Greek expositors seem to have felt, is really in the δέ: this however is neither περιττός (Theod., comp. Theod. M.); nor equivalent to οὐδέ (comp. Chrys., Theoph., ΟΕcum.); but simply explicative (‘declarat et intendit,’ Beng.), and faintly ratiocinative; see Klotz, *Devar.* Vol. II. p. 362. Alford compares δέ, ver. 2, but the uses seem clearly different: there the insertion of αὗτοῖς naturally suggests a contrast, while here the naked statement οὐκ ἡραγκ. περιττ. as naturally prepares us for a restrictive explanation. παρεισάκτους] ‘insidiously brought in.’ Scholef. This word appears to have two meanings, (a) *advena, adventitius, dillatarior*,

(Hesych., Suid., Phot.); comp. Georg. Al. *Vit. Chrys.* 40 (cited by Hase, Steph. *Thes.* Vol. VIII. p. 187), παρεισάκτε τῆς πόλεως ἡμῶν (β) *irreputitus*; comp. Profl. Sirach, πρόλογος παρεισάκτος,—a meaning still further enhanced by παρεισῆλθος compare 2 Pet. ii. 1, Jude 4. The compound ψευδαδέλφοι designates those who did not acknowledge the great principle of faith in Christ being the only means of salvation (Neander, *Plant.* Vol. II. p. 114, Bohn), while their *intrusive* character is well marked by the compounds παρεισῆλθον and παρεισάκτους. comp. Polyb. *Hist.* I. 18. 3, παρεισάγεσθαι καὶ παρεισπίπτειν εἰς τὰς πόλιορκουμένας πόλεις. *οἵτινες*] ‘men who,’ ‘a set of men who,’—not simply equivalent to εἰς (Ust.), but specifying the *class* to which they belonged: see Matth. *Gr.* § 483; Jelf, *Gr.* § 816; and notes on ch. iv. 24, where the uses of οἵτις are more fully discussed. The translation of Fritz., ‘quippe qui’ (comp. Herm. *Æd.* R. 688) is here unduly strong; even in classical Greek what is commonly termed a *causal* may be more correctly considered an *explicative* sense; see Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* s. v. 3, Vol. II. p. 383. This too is the prevailing sense in the later writers; see Dindorf in Steph. *Thesaur.* s. v. κατασκοπῆσαι] ‘to spy out,’  [ut explorarent] Syr., ‘explorare,’ Vulg.; not ‘ut dolose eripiant libertatem Christianam’ (Dindorf, Steph. *Thes.* s. v. Vol. IV. p. 1232), κατασκοπ. being here used in the same (hostile) sense as κατασκοπεύσαι, Josh. ii. 2; δρᾶς πώς καὶ τῇ τῶν κατασκόπων προσηγορίᾳ ἐδήλωσε τὸν πόλεμον ἐκείνων. Chrys. *ἐν Χριστῷ*]

ἴνα ἡμᾶς καταδουλώσοντιν· οἵς οὐδὲ πρὸς ὥραν εἰξαμεν 5
τῇ ὑποταγῇ, ἵνα ἡ ἀλήθεια τοῦ εὐαγγελίου διαμείνῃ
πρὸς ὑμᾶς. ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν δοκούντων εἶναι τι (όποιοι 6

5. *οἵς οὐδὲ*] These words are omitted by the first hand of D (Tisch. *Cod. Clarom.* p. 568); Clarom., Sang.; Ireneus (p. 200, ed. Bened.), and, according to Jerome, in some *Latin* manuscripts: Tertullian and Ambrose appear only to have rejected the relative; see *adv. Marc.* v. 3. It is obvious that such an omission would greatly simplify the structure, but this very fact in a critical point of view makes it suspicious. When to this we add the immense preponderance of external authority, we can entertain but little doubt that *οἵς οὐδὲ* is genuine; see Bagge in *loc.*, who has well discussed this reading.

Not '*per Christum*,' a meaning it *may* bear (Fritz. p. 184), but in the fuller and deeper sense '*in Christ*'; see notes on ver. 17. *ἴνα ἡμᾶς καταδουλώσοντιν*] 'that they may succeed in enslaving us,' the tense pointing to the result, the compound to the completeness of the act; comp. 2 Cor. xi. 20. Although this reading is confirmed by a decided preponderance of uncial authority [AB¹CDEN], and the improbability of a correction very great; still the instances of *ἴνα* with a future are so very few (Gayler, *Part. Neg.* p. 169), and these too so reducible in number (Klotz, *Devar. Vol. II.* p. 631), that we are not justified in saying more than this, that the future *appears* used to convey the idea of *duration* (Winer), or perhaps rather of issue, *sequence* (Schmalfeld, *Synt.* § 142; comp. Alf.), more distinctly than the more usual aorist subj. Though excessively doubtful in classical writers (Herm. *Partic. dv.* II. 13, p. 134), a few instances are found in later authors; see Winer, *Gr.* § 41, b. 1, p. 259.

5. *τῇ ὑποταγῇ*] 'by yielding them the subjection they claimed,' dative of manner; see Winer, *Gr.* § 31. 7, p. 194, comp. Scheuerl. *Synt.* § 22. 6, p. 180. The article is not merely the article with abstract nouns (Green,

Gr. p. 146), but is used to specify the obedience which the false brethren (not the Apostles, Fritz.) demanded in this particular case.

ἡ ἀλήθεια τοῦ εὐαγγελίου] 'the truth of the *Gospel*,' the true teaching of the *Gospel*, as opposed to the false teaching of it as propagated by Judaizers, i.e. as in verse 16, the doctrine of justification by faith. The distinction drawn by Winer (*Gr.* § 34. 3, p. 211) between such expressions as the present,—where the governing noun is a distinct element pertaining to the governed; and such as *πλούτου δῆμητης*, 1 Tim. vi. 17, *καινότης σωῆς*, Rom. vi. 4,—where it is more a rhetorically expressed attribute, though denied by Fritz. *Rom. Vol. I.* p. 368, seems perfectly just. A doctrinal import is contained in *ἡ ἀλήθεια τοῦ εὐαγγ.*, which is entirely lost by explaining it as merely *τὸ δῆμητές εὐαγγελίον*.

Θαμάνη πρὸς ὑμᾶς] 'might remain steadfast with you,' 'perseverat [-eret],' Vulg., Clarom.; the διὰ being obviously intensive, as in Heb. i. 11, 2 Pet. iii. 4; comp. Chrys., *ἴνα.....τοῦτο διὰ τῶν ἔργων βεβαιώσωμεν.* πρὸς ὑμᾶς] See on ch. i. 18.

6. *ἀντὶ διὰ τῶν δοκούντων εἶναι τι κ.τ.λ.*] 'But from those who were high in reputation;—interrupted declaration of his independence of the εἰ-

ποτε ἡσαν οὐδέν μοι διαφέρει πρόσωπον Θεὸς ἀνθρώ-

δοκοῦντες. The meaning of this verse is perfectly clear, but the structure is somewhat difficult. According to the common explanation, *ἀπὸ—εἶναι τι* is a sentence that would naturally have terminated with *οὐδὲν ἔλαβον* or *προσ-ελαβόμην* (not *ἔδιδάχθην*, Winer, § 47, p. 331), or more correctly still, *οὐδέν μοι προσανείθη* owing however to the parenthesis *ὅτοις—λαμβάνει*, the natural structure is interrupted, and the sentence, commenced *passively*, is concluded *actively* with *ἔμοι γάρ κ.τ.λ.* see Winer, *Gr.* § 63. I. 1, p. 502. The real difficulty of the sentence however lies in the following *γάρ*. That it is (a) merely *resumptive*, Scholef. (*Hints*, p. 74), Peile, al., is indemonstrable; as of the passages usually cited in favour of this force, viz. Acts xvii. 28, 1 Cor. ix. 19, 2 Cor. v. 4, Rom. xv. 27, the first three are clearly instances of the argumentative force (see Winer, *Gr.* § 53. 10. 3, p. 403; Meyer on *Cor. ll.cc.*) while in the fourth the words *εἴδόκησαν γάρ* are merely emphatically repeated. That it is (b) *argumentative*, either as giving a reason for *οὐδέν μοι διαφέρει κ.τ.λ.* (Alf.), or for *πρόσωπον Θεὸς κ.τ.λ.* (Mey.), is logically and contextually improbable, as parenthetical and non-parenthetical parts would thus be confused and intermingled. If however *γάρ* be regarded as (c) *explicative*, the whole seems clear and logical. To avoid the words *δοκοῦντων εἶναι τι* being misunderstood, and supposed to assign an *undue* pre-eminence to these Apostles, St Paul hastily introduces the parenthetical comment, leaving the former sentence incomplete: then, feeling that its meaning was still so far obvious as to need some justification, he reverts to it, slightly qualifying it by the emphatic *ἔμοι*, slightly

justifying it by the explicative *γάρ*: ‘*to me* (whatever they might have done for others) *it is certainly a fact that*,’ etc. On this explicative force of *γάρ*, see Donalds, *Gr.* § 6:8; Klotz, *Derar.* Vol. II. p. 233 sq.; Hartung, *Partik.* *γάρ*, § 2; and comp. Lücke, *John* iv. 44. Of the other interpretations of this difficult passage, none appear to deserve special notice except that of the Greek writers (Chrys. however is silent, and Theod. has here a *lacuna*), who connect *ἀπὸ τῶν δοκ.* immediately with *οὐδέν μοι διαφ.* in the sense of *οὐδεὶς μοι φρουρής τερπτῶν δοκ.* (Theoph.), but thus assign an untenable meaning to *ἀπό*, and dislocate the almost certain connexion of *ὅτοις ποτὲ ἡσαν* with what follows. Further details will be found in Meyer, De Wette, and Fritzsche (*Opusc.* p. 201 sq.). The Vv. are for the most part perplexingly literal (comp. Vulg.); the Syr. however by its change of *γάρ* into *━* seems certainly in accordance with the general view adopted above. *τῶν δοκοῦντων εἶναι τι*] ‘*who were deemed to be somewhat*,’ *━* [qui reputati erant] Syr., ‘*qui videbantur, &c.*’ Vulg.; used with reference to the judgment of *others* (contrast ch. vi. 3), and so perfectly similar in meaning to *τοῖς δοκοῦσι*, verse 2; comp. Plato, *Gorg.* p. 472 A, *τινὲς πολλῶν καὶ δοκ. εἶναι τι*: *Euthyd.* p. 303 C, *τῶν σεμιῶν καὶ δοκ. τι εἶναι.* *ὅτοις ποτὲ*] ‘*qualescumque*;’ *ποτὲ* not being temporal, ‘*olim*,’ Beza (perhaps suggested by the ‘*aliquando*’ of Vulg.), but connected with *ὅτοις*, which it serves to render more general and inclusive: comp. Demosth. *Or. de Pace*, IV. 13 (p. 60), *ὅτοις τις ποτὲ*

που οὐ λαμβάνει) ἐμοὶ γὰρ οἱ δοκοῦντες οὐδὲν προσ-
ανέθεντο, ἀλλὰ τούναντίον ιδόντες ὅτι πεπίστευμαι τὸ 7
εὐαγγέλιον τῆς ἀκροβυντίας καθὼς Πέτρος τῆς περιτο-

ἐστιν αὕτη, cited by Bloomf. and Fritz. *in loc.* ήσαν may certainly refer to the period of the Apostles' lives when they were unconverted, or when they were in attendance on our Lord (a view strongly supported by Hilgenf.); it seems however far more natural to refer the tense to a past, relative to the time of writing the words.

οὐδέν μοι διαφέντει] 'it maketh no matter to me.' For examples of this less usual but fully defensible insertion of the dative, see Lobeck, *Phryn.* p. 384, and comp. Wetst. *in loc.*

πρόσωπον Θεὸς κ.τ.λ.] 'God accepteth no man's person,'—*πρόσωπον* put forward with emphasis, while Θεὸς and *διθρ.* form a suggestive contrast (Mey.); 'God looketh not to the outward as men do, and judgeth on no partial principles, and no more did I his servant.' This and the equiv. expression *βλέπειν εἰς πρόσωπον. διθρ.* are in the N. T. always used with a bad reference; see Matth. xxii. 16, Mark xii. 14, Luke xx. 21. The corresponding expression in the O. T. בְּלֹא נִצְחָה (translated sometimes θαυμάζειν πρόσωπον, comp. Jude 16) is used occasionally in a good sense; see Gen. xix. 21, and comp. Fritz. and Schott *in loc.*

προσανέθεντο] 'communicated nothing,' 'addressed no communication to;' 'contulerunt,' Vulg., Clarom.; and more distinctly, 'dixerunt,' Eth.-Pol., 'notum fecerunt,' Arm.; as in ch. i. 16. In spite of the authority of the Greek expositors (*μαθήτες τὰ ἔμα σύδेν προσέθηκαν, οὐδὲν διέρθωσαν* Chrys.) and appy. of Syr. (οστῷο) adjecterunt), Copt.

[ououah], Goth. ('anaInskun'), al., it still seems more safe to retain the same meaning in both passages. There is weight in the argument urged in ed. 1 (see too Wieseler, *Chronol.* p. 195, note), that *προσανέθεντο* here may seem to specify addition, as in contrast with *ἀνέθειμην* ver. 2; still the tendency of later Greek to compound forms (comp. notes on ch. iii. 13), and the perfect parallelism of this with the similarly negative formulas in ch. i. 16, are tacit arguments which seem slightly to preponderate. In the passage commonly referred to (Xen. *Mem.* II. 1. 8), *προσανέθεσθαι* merely implies 'etiam sibi adjungere, scil. suscipere' (see Kühner *in loc.*), and so proves nothing, except that Bretsch., Olsh., Rück., al., must be incorrect in translating 'nihil mihi præterea imposuerunt,' as this expresses a directly opposite idea. Under any circumstances, there is nothing either in this word or in the whole paragraph to substantiate the extraordinary position of Baur, that the Apostles only yielded to St Paul's views after a long struggle.

7. ἀλλὰ τούναντίον] 'but on the contrary;' scil. so far from giving instructions to me, they practically added the weight of their approval: τὸ ἐναντίον τοῦ μέμψασθαι τὸ ἐπανέται. Chrys. Surely this was not exactly leaving St Paul 'to fight his own battle,' Jowett, Alf.

πεπίστευμαι] The principal instances in the N. T. of this well-known structure will be found, Winer, Gr. § 32. 5, p. 204. On the use of the perfect as indicating permanence, duration, 'conceditum mihi habeo,' see ib. § 40. 4, p. 242. Usteri calls attention to the accurate

8 μῆς (ό γὰρ ἐνεργήσας Πέτρῳ εἰς ἀποστολὴν τῆς περι-
9 τομῆς ἐνήργησεν κάμοὶ εἰς τὰ ἔθνη) καὶ γνόντες τὴν
χάριν τὴν δοθεῖσάν μοι, Ἰάκωβος καὶ Κηφᾶς καὶ Ἰωάν-

use of the perf. here, compared with the aorist in Rom. iii. 2, ἐπιστείθησαν ('Ιουδαῖον) τὰ λόγια τοῦ Θεοῦ.
τῆς ἀκροβυστίας] 'of the uncircum-
cision,' scil. τῶν ἀκροβύστων οὐ τὰ πρόγματα λέγων αὐτά, ἀλλὰ τὰ ἀπὸ τούτων γνωριζόμενα ἔθνη'. Chrys.; comp. Rom. iii. 30. The derivation of ἀκροβ. (not ἀκρον, βίω, but an Alexandrian corruption of ἀκροτοσθία) is discussed by Fritzsche, *Rom.* ii. 26, Vol. I. p. 136.

καθὼς Πέτρος κ.τ.λ.] 'even as Peter was of the circumcision.' St Peter here appears as the representative of the 'Judenapostel' (Meyer; comp. Grot.), on the principle that 'a potiori fit denominatio'; for though originally chosen out as the first preacher to the Gentiles (Acts xv. 7), his subsequent labours appear to have been more among Jews; comp. 1 Pet. i. 1. On the use of καθὼς, see notes on ch. iii. 6; and on its most suitable translation, comp. notes on 1 Thess. i. 5 (*Transl.*).

8. ὁ γὰρ ἐνεργ. κ.τ.λ.] 'For He who wrought (effectually) for Peter,' **Πέτρος** Syr., 'Petro,' Vulg., Claram.; not 'in Petro,' Grot.; historical confirmation of what precedes, added parenthetically. There are four constructions of ἐνεργέω in St Paul's Epp.; (a) ἐνεργέω τι, 1 Cor. xii. 11; (b) ἐνερ-
γέω τῷ τινι, Eph. ii. 2; (c) ἐνεργέω τι
ἐν τινι, ch. iii. 5; (d) ἐνεργέω τῷ εἰς τι, here; comp. Prov. xxxi. 12. In this latter case the dative is not governed by ἐνεργέω, as the verb is not a pure compound [there is no form ἐργέω] but is the dat. *commodi*. 'Ο ἐνεργήσας, it may be observed, is

not Christ (Chrys., Aug.), but God (Jerome); for, in the first place, St Paul always speaks of his Apostleship as given by God (Rom. xv. 15, 1 Cor. xv. 10, Eph. iii. 2) through Christ (Rom. i. 5; comp. ib. xv. 18, and ch. i. 1); and, secondly, this ἐνεργεῖν is distinctly ascribed to God, 1 Cor. xiii. 6, Phil. ii. 13. **εἰς ἀποστολὴν**] 'for or towards the Apostleship,' i.e. for the successful performance of it (Hamm.); not merely 'in respect of it' (Mey.)—a meaning lexically admissible both in classical writers (Rost u. Palm, *Lex.* s. v. *eis*, v. 2, Vol. I. p. 804), and in the N. T. (Winer, *Gr.* § 49. a, p. 354), but here contextually insufficient, as the sense seems almost obviously to require the more definite notion of *purpose*, or contemplated object; comp. 2 Cor. ii. 12, *eis* τὸ εὐαγ-
γῆλιον (to preach the Gospel), Col. i. 29. The second *eis* is joined with τὰ ἔθνη by what is called 'comparatio compendiaria.' Jelf, *Gr.* § 781.

9. καὶ γνώντες] 'and having become aware,' continuation of the interrupted narrative; **ἰδὼντες** (ver. 7).....καὶ γνώντες. The former participle appears to refer to the mental impression produced, when the nature and success of St Paul's preaching was brought before them; the latter, to the result of the actual information they derived from him; but see notes ch. iv. 9. **Ιάκωβος**] 'James,' the Brother of our Lord (ch. i. 19), Bishop of Jerusalem,—and as such placed first in order in the recital of acts that took place in that Church. Irenaeus (*Hær.* III. 12, ad fin.) in noticing this subject uses the strong expression 'qui circa Jacobum Apostoli'; see Grabe in loc.

νης, οἱ δοκοῦντες στῦλοι εἶναι, δεξιὰς ἔδωκαν ἐμοὶ καὶ
Βαρνάβᾳ κοινωνίας ἵνα ἡμεῖς εἰς τὰ ἔθνη, αὐτοὶ δὲ εἰς
τὴν περιτομήν μόνον τῶν πτωχῶν ἵνα μνημονεύωμεν, ΙΟ
δὲ καὶ ἐσπούδαστο αὐτὸ τοῦτο ποιῆσαι.

The reading Πέτρ. καὶ Ἰάκ. has but weak external support [DEFG; old-Lat. Vv., Goth., al.], and on internal grounds is highly suspicious.
^{οἱ δοκοῦντες κ.τ.λ.]} ‘who have the reputation of being,’ οὐδὲ πάντες παραχρῶν περιφέρουσιν Chrys.; δοκέω not being pleonastic, but retaining its usual and proper meaning: see exx. in Winer, Gr. § 65. 7, p. 540. The metaphor is illustrated by Suicer, *Thes. s.v. στῦλος*, Vol. II. 1044; Wetst. in loc.; and (from Rabbinical writers) by Schoettg. *Hor. Hebr.* Vol. I. pp. 728, 729. The most apposite quotations are perhaps, Clem. Rom. I. 5, οἱ μέγιστοι καὶ δικαιοτάτοι στῦλοι Euseb. *Hist.* VI. 41, οἱ στεφφοὶ καὶ μακροῖς στῦλοι τοῦ Κυρίου. **δεξιὰ...κοινωνίας**] ‘right hands of fellowship,’ scil. in the Apostolic office of teaching and preaching; comp. Schulz, *Abendm.* p. 190 sq. The remark of Fritzsche (*Opusc.* p. 220, comp. Mey.), —‘articulum τὰς δεξιὰς τῆς κοινωνίας non desiderabit, qui δεξ. κοιν. dexteras sociales, i.e. dexteras ejusmodi quibus societas conficitur, valere reputaverit,’ is scarcely necessary. Αἱ δεξιὰ in the phrase δεξιὰς διδόναι (1 Macc. xi. 50, 62, xiii. 50) is usually anarthrous, the principle of correlation (Middleton, *Gr. Art.* III. 33) causes it to be omitted with *κοινωνίας*: comp. Winer, Gr. § 18. 2, 6, p. 142. The separation of the gen. from the subst. on which it depends occurs occasionally in St Paul’s Epp., and is usually due either to explanatory specification (Phil. ii. 10), correction (1 Thess. ii. 13), emphasis (1 Tim. iii. 6), or, as appy. here, merely structural reasons,—the natural union of δεξιὰς and έδωκαν, and of

έδωκαν and its dative; comp. Winer, Gr. § 30. 3. 2, p. 172.
ἴνα ἡμ. εἰς τὰ ἔθνη] ‘that we—to the Gentiles,’ not εὐαγγελιζόμεθα (Winer, Gr. p. 518), as this verb is not found with εἰς in St Paul’s Epp. (Mey.), but either simply παρενθώμεν, or perhaps better ἀπόστολοι γεγόμεθα, ‘apostolatus fungeremur.’ Beza. It is scarcely necessary to add that this compact was intended to be rather general than specific, and that the terms *ἔθνη* and *περιπομῆ* have more of a geographical than a merely personal reference. St Paul knew himself to be the Apostle of the Gentiles (comp. Rom. xi. 13), but this did not prevent him (*κατὰ τὸ εὐθέος*, Acts xvii. 2) while in Gentile lands from preaching first to the Jews; see Acts xvii. 10, xviii. 5, xix. 8. The insertion of μέν after ἡμεῖς [with ACDE; more than 30 mss.; Copt., Syr.-Philox.; Chrys., al.] seems certainly a grammatical insertion.

10. μόνον τὰν πτωχῶν κ.τ.λ.] ‘only that we should remember the poor.’ limiting clause dependent on δεξιὰς έδωκαν and expressive of the condition attached to the general compact: ‘we were to go to the Gentiles, they to the circumcision, with this stipulation only, that we were not to forget the poor (in Judæa);’ comp. Rom. xv. 26, 27, 1 Cor. xvi. 3. There is thus no ellipsis of *ἄλοιντες*, *παρακαλοῦντες*, or indeed of any verb; the μόνον carries its own explanation: ‘imperium ipsa voce μόνον adsignificatum, ut id sit quod καὶ παρήγγειλαν.’ Fritz. *Matt. Excurs.* I, p. 839.

δὲ καὶ ἐσπούδαστο κ.τ.λ.] ‘which very thing I was also forward to do,’ lite-

II. Ὁτε δὲ ἦλθεν Κηφᾶς εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν,
κατὰ πρόσωπον αὐτῷ ἀντέστην, ὅτι κατε-

When Peter dissem-
bled, I withstood and
rebuked him, urging
that to observe the
law as a justifying
principle is to make void the grace of God.

rally ‘which, namely this very thing, I was also, &c.’ *aὐτὸν τοῦτο* (Ἄστι^τ Πάστι^τ Syr.) not being redundantly joined with δ ‘per Hebraismum’ (Rück., B.-Crus., and even Conyb.), but simply forming an emphatic epexegetis of the preceding relative; see Winer. *Gr.* § 22. 4, p. 134. Occasionally in the N. T. (Mark i. 7, vii. 25, Rev. vii. 2, al.) and (as might be conceived) not uncommonly in the LXX., there seem to be clear instances of a Hebraistic redundancy of the simple *aὐτός*, but appy. never of this stronger form *aὐτὸς οὗτος*; see Winer, *Gr. l.c.*, and comp. Bornem. *Schol. Luc.* p. 114. [εἰπούσθαι] ‘I was forward,’ ‘I evinced σπουδὴν’ with an appended object-infinitive; comp. Eph. iv. 3, 1 Thess. ii. 17. The aor. is here correctly used, not for the perfect (Conyb.), nor even for the pluperf., nor yet exactly as expressing the *habit* (comp. Alf.)—this usage being somewhat doubtful in the N. T. (see Winer, *Gr.* § 40. 5. 1, p. 248; and notes on *Eph.* i. 3);—but simply as marking an historical fact that belongs to the past, without it being affirmed or denied that it may not continue to the present; see Fritz. *de Aor.* Vi, p. 17, and notes on 1 *Thess.* ii. 16. The passages usually adduced (Rom. xv. 27, 1 Cor. xvi. 1 sq., 2 Cor. viii. 2 sq., comp. Acts xi. 17 sq., xxiv. 17) illustrate the practice, but not the tense, being subsequent to the probable date of this Epistle. All historical deductions from this passage, except perhaps that Barnabas had recently left St Paul (hence the sing.; see Winer, *in loc.*), seem very precarious.

III. Ὁτε δὲ ἦλθεν Κηφᾶς] ‘But

when Cephas came, &c.’ Still further proof of the Apostle’s independence by an historical notice of his opposition to, and even reproof of, St Peter’s inconsistent conduct at Antioch: see some good remarks on this subject in Thiersch, *Hist. of Church*, Vol. I. p. 123 sq. (Transl.). The reading

Πέτρος (*Rec.*) is fairly supported [DE FGKL; many mss.; Demid., Goth., al.], but still even in external authority is inferior to Κηφᾶς [*Lachm.*, *Tisch.*, with ABCHN; a few mss.; Syr., Copt.; Clem., al.], not to mention the high probability of Πέτρος having been an explanatory change.

κατὰ πρόσωπον] ‘to the face,’ Auth. ‘in faciem,’ Vulg., Προσώπῳ [in faciem ejus] Syr.—not ‘coram omnibus,’ ‘aperto Marte’ (Elsn., Conyb., al.), this being specified in εμπροσθεν πάντων, ver. 14: comp. Acts xv. 16, and perhaps ib. iii. 13, κατὰ πρόσωπον Πιλάτου, ‘to the face of Pilate.’ The preposition has here its secondary local meaning, ‘*e regione*’; the primary idea of horizontal direction (Donalds. *Gr.* § 479) passing naturally into that of local opposition. This may be very clearly traced in the descriptions of the positions of troops, &c. by the later military writers; e. g. Polyb. *Hist.* I. 34. 5. οἱ κατὰ τοὺς ἐλέφαντας ταχθέντες *ib.* id. 9, οἱ κατὰ τὸ λαιόν with πρόσωπον, *ib.* III. 65. 6, XI. 14. 6: see Bernhardy, *Synt.* v. 20. b, p. 240; Dobree, *Advers.* Vol. I. p. 114. The gloss κατὰ σχῆμα (in appearance, —not in reality) adopted by Chrys., Jerome, and several early writers, is wholly untenable, and due only to an innocent though mistaken effort to save the authority of St Peter, appy.

γνωσμένος ἦν. πρὸ τοῦ γὰρ ἐλθεῖν τινὰς ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου 12 μετὰ τῶν ἐθνῶν συνήσθιεν δότε δὲ ἡλθον, ὑπέστελλεν

first suggested by Origen [Strom. Book x.]: see Jerome, *Epist.* 86—97, esp. 89; the appy. unanswerable objections of Augustine (*Epist.* 8—19); the sensible remarks of Bede in *loc.*; and, for much curious information on the whole subject, Deyling, *Obs. Sacr.* Vol. II. p. 520 sq. (No. 45). **δότε κατεγνωσμένος ἦν]** ‘because he had been condemned,’ not ‘reprohibilis,’ Vulg., nor even ‘reprehensionem incurserat,’ Winer, but simply ‘reprehensus erat,’ Clarom., Goth., Syr.-Phil. (Syr. paraphrases), al. As this clause has been much encumbered with glosses, it will be best to notice separately both the meaning of the verb, and the force of the participle. (1) *Kataγιγνώσκειν* (generally with *τινός τι*, more rarely with *τινά τινος*) has two principal meanings; (a) ‘to note accurately;’ usually in a bad sense, e.g. ‘detect,’ Prov. xxviii. 11 (Aquil. *ἔξιχνασει*), ‘think ill of,’ Xen. *Mem.* I. 3, 10; (b) ‘to note judicially,—either in the lighter sense of accuse (probably 1 John iii. 20; see Lücke in *loc.*), or the graver of condemn, the more usual meaning. (2) The perf. part. pass. cannot be used as a pure verbal adjective. The examples adduced by Eisner in *loc.* will all bear a different explanation; and even those in which the use of the participle seems to approach that of the Hebrew part. (see Gesen. *Gr.* § 131. 1), such as Rev. xxi. 8 (perf. part.), Jude 12 (aor.), or Heb. xii. 18 (pres.), can all be explained grammatically; see Winer, *Gr.* § 45. 1, p. 307.

The only tenable translations then are (a) ‘he had been accused,’ or (b) ‘he had been condemned;’ and of these (b) seems obviously most in accordance with the context and the nature

of the case. As St Peter’s conduct had been condemned, not merely by himself (Alf.), but, as seems more natural, generally by the sounder body of Christians at Antioch, St Paul, as the representative of the anti-Judaical party, feels himself authorized to rebuke him, and that too (ver. 14) publicly.

12. *τινὲς δὲ ἐλθόντες* may be connected together, and grammatically translated, ‘some of the followers of James:’ see Jelf, *Gr.* 620. 3; Bernhardy, *Synt.* v. 12, p. 222. As however in the N. T. this mode of periphrasis (*οἱ δὲ κ.τ.λ.*) appears mainly confined to *places* (Mark iii. 22, Acts vi. 9. xxvii. 44, al.), or abstract substantives (Acts xv. 5), it will seem most exact to connect *δὲ* ‘Iaz. with *ἐλθεῖν*. So distinctly *Aeth.-Pol.*, omitting however the *τινές* the other Vv. mainly preserve the order of the Greek. We certainly cannot deduce from this that they were ‘sent by James’ (Theophyl., Mey., Alf.), for though this use of *δὲ* does occur (comp. Matt. xxvi. 47 with Mark xiv. 43, and see Fritz. *Matt.* Vol. I. p. 779), yet the common meaning of the prep. in such constructions is *local* rather than *ethical*,—*separation* rather than *mission from*; compare Knapp, *Script. Var. Argum.* p. 510. The men in question probably represented themselves as rigid followers of St James, and are thus briefly noticed as having come *δὲ ἐλθόντες*, rather than *δὲ Ιεροπολίτας*.

συνήσθιεν ‘was eating with them,’ i.e. again followed that course which in the case of Cornelius similarly called forth the censure of *οἱ ἐπεροῦμεν* (Acts xi. 2), but was then nobly vindicated. Of the two follow-

καὶ ἀφώριζεν ἑαυτόν, φοβούμενος τοὺς ἐκ περιτομῆς·
 13 καὶ συνυπεκρίθησαν αὐτῷ καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ Ἰουδαῖοι, ὅστε
 14 καὶ Βαρνάβας συναπήχθη αὐτῶν τῇ ὑποκρίσει. ἀλλ᾽

ing verbs ὑπέστ. and ἀφώρ. (both governing ἑαυτόν) the first does not mark the *secret*, the second the *open* course (Matth.), but simply the *initial* and *more completed acts*, respectively: the second was the result of the first, De Wette *in loc.*

The reading ἡλθεν (Lachm.) has considerable external authority [BD¹FGN; 2 mss.; Clarom.], but is a not improbable conformation to the sing. which follows.

φοβούμενος] ‘fearing,’ ‘because he feared,’

ἵστι [quia timebat]; causal participle explaining the feeling which led to the preceding acts; ‘timens ne culparetur ab ipsis’ Irenaeus, *Hær.* III. 12 (ad fin.). The Greek commentators [there is a lacuna in Theod.] and others (see Poli *Synops.* *in loc.*) have endeavoured to modify the application of this word, but without lexical authority. As on a different occasion (Matt. xiv. 30), so here again the Apostle drew back from a course into which his first and best feelings had hastily led him. Some strongly-expressed remarks on this subject will be found in South, *Serm. xxviii.* Vol. II. p. 476 (Tegg).

13. συνυπεκρ. αὐτῷ] ‘joined with him in dissimulation;’ result of the bad example,—the secession of the rest of the Jewish Christians at Antioch from social communion with the Gentile converts. The meaning of συνυπεκρ. is softened down by Syr. [subjecerunt se cum illo], Clarom. (‘consenserunt cum illo’), al., but without reason; these very Christians of Antioch were the first who knew and rejoiced at (Acts xv. 31) the

practically contrary decision of the Council. A good ‘præelectio’ on this text will be found in Sanderson, *Works*, Vol. IV. p. 44 (ed. Jacobs.).

ὅστε] ‘so that,—as a simple matter of fact. In this form of the consecutive sentence the distinction between ὅστε with the indic. and the infin. can scarcely be maintained in translation. The latter (the *objective* form, as it is termed by Schmalfeld) is used when the result is a necessary and logical consequence of what has previously been enunciated; the former, when it is stated by the writer (the *subjective* form) as a simple and unconditioned fact: see Klotz, *Devar.* Vol. II. p. 772; and esp. Schmalfeld, *Synt.* § 155 sq., and Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* s. v. Vol. II. p. 1101 sq., where the uses of this particle are well discussed. Here, for example, St Paul notices the lapse of Barnabas as a fact, without implying that it was a necessary consequence of the behaviour of the others. This distinction however is appy. not always observed in the N.T., nor indeed always in classical writers: comp. Winer, *Gr.* § 41. 5. 1, p. 269.

αὐτῶν τῇ ὑποκρίσει] ‘was carried away with them by their dissimulation,’ scil. into dissimulation: ‘cum dativo personæ συναρχῇ. simul cum aliquo abduci, etc. declarat; cum dativo rei, simul per rem abduci, etc. significat.’ Fritz, *Rom.* XII. 16, Vol. III. p. 88 sq. Σὺ thus refers to the companions in the τὸ ἀπάγεσθαι· ὑποκρίσει to the instrument by which,—not ‘rei ad quam’ (Bretsch., comp. Alf.), a questionable construction even in poetry (Bernhardy, *Synt.* III.

ὅτε εἶδον ὅτι οὐκ ὄρθοποδοῦσιν πρὸς τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, εἰπον τῷ Κηφᾷ ἐμπροσθεν πάντων Εἰ σὺ Ἰουδαῖος ὑπάρχων ἐθνικῶς καὶ οὐκ Ἰουδαϊκῶς

14. *Ἰουδαϊκῶς* [ἢ] This order is maintained by ABCFGN; 4 mss.; Aug., Boern., Am., Demid., al.; Or., Phil. (Carp.); many Lat. Ff. (but *καὶ οὐκ Ἰουδ.* is omitted in Clarom., Sang., Ambrost., Sedul., Agap.); so Lachm., Meyer. Tisch. reads ἔθν. ἢς *καὶ οὐκ Ἰουδ.*, with DEKL; nearly all mss.; majority of Vv.; Chrys., Theod., Dam., Theophyl., Ecum. (Rec., Scholz, Alf.). External authority thus appears decidedly in favour of the text, and is but little modified by internal arguments, for a correction for perspicuity (*ἔθν. ἢς*) is quite as probable as the assumed one ‘for elegance’ (Alf.). *πῶς*] It is difficult to imagine why Tisch. rejected this reading, supported as it is by ABCDEFGN; mss.; majority of Vv.; Or., Dam., and Lat. Ff. (Griesb., Scholz, Lachm., *De W.*, Mey., approved by Mill, Prolegom. p. 123). For *τι*, which seems very much like an *interpr.*, the authorities are KL; great majority of mss.; Syr.-Phil., al.; Chrys., Theod., Theophyl., Ecum. (Rec. Tisch.)

12, p. 95),—and, by obvious *inference*, the state *into which* they were carried away: see 2 Pet. iii. 17. Fritzsche cites Zosim. *Hist.* v. 6, *καὶ αὐτὴ δὲ ἡ Σπάρτη συναπήγετο τῷ καινῷ τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἀλώσει*, κ.τ.λ. add Clem. Alex. *Strom.* I. p. 311, *τῇ ἡδονῇ συναπαγμένος*. ‘Τπόκρισις is well paraphrased by Wieseler (*Chronol.* p. 197), as ‘a practical denial of their better [spiritual] insight,—and (we add) of their better feelings and knowledge; see above, on *συνυπεκρήθησαν*.

14. *ὄρθοποδοῦσιν*] ‘walk uprightly,’ an *ἀναξ λεγόμ.* in the N. T., and *very rare* elsewhere: Dindorf and Jacobs in Steph. *Thesaur.* s.v. cite a few instances from later writers, e.g. Theodor. Stud. p. 308 B, 443 D, 473 D, 509 D, 575 E (Sirmond, *Op. Var.* Vol. v. Venet. 1728). The meaning however is sufficiently obvious, and rightly expressed by the ‘recte ambulare’ of Vulg., Syr., and the best Vv.: comp. *Ὀρθόπεδος*, Soph. *Antig.* 972 (985), the similar verb *Ὀρθοπομεῖν*, 2 Tim. ii. 15, and notes *in loc.*

On the idiomatic use of the present in the narration of a past event, when

‘continuance’ or ‘process’ is implied, see Winer, *Gr.* § 40. 2. c. p. 239, and esp. Schmalfeld, *Synt.* § 54. 6, p. 96. *πρὸς τὴν ἀλήθειαν*] ‘according to the truth,’ i.e. ‘according to the rule of,’ the prep. here seeming to mark not so much the *aim* or *direction* (Hamm., Mey., Alf.), as the *rule* or *measure* of the *Ὀρθοποδεῖν*: comp. 2 Cor. v. 10, *κομιστηται... πρὸς ἀ ἐπράξειν*, and see Winer, *Gr.* § 49. h, p. 361. The objection of Meyer, that St Paul always expresses ‘rule,’ ‘measure,’ *etc.* after verba *eundi* by *κατά*, not *πρὸς*, does not here fully apply, as motion is much more obscurely expressed in *Ὀρθοποδεῖν* than *περιπατεῖν* (St Paul’s favourite verb of moral motion), which appears in all the instances that Meyer has adduced, viz. Rom. viii. 4, xiv. 15; 1 Cor. iii. 3. *ἐμπροσθεν πάντων*] ‘before all men;’ ‘publicum scandalum non poterat private curari;’ Jerome; comp. 1 Tim. v. 20. The speech which follows (ver. 14—21) is appy. rightly regarded as the *substance* of what was said by the Apostle on this important occasion; see on ver. 15. *θητικῶς* [*ἢς*]

15 ζῆς, πῶς τὰ ἔθνη ἀναγκάζεις Ἰουδαῖούς; ημεῖς φύσει

'livest after a Gentile fashion,' scil. in thy general and habitual way of living. The tense must not be overpressed. St Peter was not at that exact moment living ἔθνικῶς: his former conduct however (*μερὰ τῶν ἔθνων συνήσθετε*, ver. 12) is justly assumed by St Paul as his regular and proper course of living (comp. Neand. *Planting*, Vol. II. p. 83, Bohn), and specified as such to give a greater force to the reproof; see Usteri in loc. *ἀναγκάζεις* 'constrainest thou,' not 'invitas exemplo,' Grot., nor even 'wouldest thou constrain,' Conyb.,—but simply and plainly 'cogis,' Vulg.,

¶ Syr., with reference to the moral influence and practical constraint (Hamm., Fell) which the authority and example of an Apostle like St Peter could not fail to have exercised on the Christians at Antioch. To suppose that the Apostle joined with *οἱ ἀνθρώποι* in actual outward coercion (Wieseler, *Chronol.* p. 198), is neither required by the word (see remarks in Sturz, *Lex. Xenoph.* Vol. I. p. 186) nor in any way to be inferred from the context. *Ἰουδαῖούς* 'to Judaize,' 'Judaizare,' Vulg., Clarom., 'Iudaiviskon,' Goth.; not merely synonymous with *Ἰουδαῖος* *ἰητός* (Schott; comp. Syr.), but probably a little more definite and inclusive, and carrying with it the idea of a more studied imitation and obedience; comp. Esth. viii. 17.

15. ημεῖς κ.τ.λ.] 'We,' scil. 'you and I, and others like us,' *κοινωνοί* *τὸν λεγόμενον*. Chrys. St Paul here begins, as Meyer observes, with a concessive statement: 'We, I admit, have this advantage, that by birth we are Jews, not Gentiles, and consequently (*καὶ consecutio*, comp. notes

on i *Thess.* iv. 1, and Klotz, *Devar.* Vol. I. p. 107) as such, sinners.' In the very admission however there seems a gentle irony; 'born Jews—yes, and nothing more—sinners of the Jews at best,' comp. Stier, *Ephes.* Vol. I. p. 257. With regard to the construction, it seems best with Herm. to supply *ἐσμὲν* to this verse, which thus constitutes a concessive protasis, ver. 16 (*εἰδότες δὲ κ.τ.λ.*) supplying the apodosis. It is now scarcely necessary to add that in sentences of this nature there is no *ellipsis* of *μέν* 'recte autem ibi non ponitur (*μέν*) ubi aut non sequitur membrum oppositum, aut scriptores oppositionem addere nondum constituerant, aut loquentes alterius membra oppositionem quacunque de causa non indixerunt'; Fritz, *Rom.* x. 19, Vol. II. p. 423; comp. Jelf, *Gr.* § 770, and Buttmann, *Mid.* (Excurs. XII.) p. 148.

This verse and what follows have been deemed as addressed to the Galatians either directly (Calv., Grot.), or indirectly, in the form of meditative musings (Jowett),—but with little plausibility. The speech seems clearly continued to the end of the chapter (Chrys., Theod., Jerome), and to be the *substance* of what was said: it is not however unnatural also to suppose that it may here be expressed in a slightly altered *form*, and in a shape calculated to be more intelligible, and more immediately applicable to the Apostle's present readers. For a paraphrase, see notes to *Transl.*, and also Usteri, *Lehrb.* II. I. 2, p. 161. φύσει] 'by nature,' not merely by habit and custom as the proselytes; *ἐκ γένους καὶ οὐ προσήλυτοι*: Theod.-Mops. This passage is important as serving to fix the meaning of *φύσις* in *loci dogmatici*,

Ιουδαῖοι καὶ οὐκ ἐξ ἔθνων ἀμαρτωλοί· εἰδότες δὲ ὅτι 16
οὐ δικαιοῦται ἄνθρωπος ἐξ ἔργων νόμου ἐὰν μὴ διὰ

such as Eph. ii. 3: see esp. Stier, *Ephes.* Vol. I. p. 257.

ἀμαρτωλοί The point of view from which a Jew must naturally consider them (Eph. ii. 12); perhaps with slight irony (Stier, *Red. Jes.* Vol. VI. p. 307). That they were so regarded needs no other proof than such expressions as τελῶναι καὶ ἀμαρτωλοί comp. Tobit xiii. 6.

16. εἰδότες δέ] ‘but as we know,’

τικτότες; **τικτό** [quia novimus]

Syr.; causal participle (Jelf, *Gr.* § 697, Schmalfeld, *Synt.* § 207) attached to ἐπιστρέψας, and introducing the apodosis to the preceding concessive sentence. Reconsideration seems still to show that of the many explanations of this difficult passage, this is appy. the simplest. According to the common interpret., εἰδότες δέ...Χριστοῦ forms an interposed sentence between ver. 15 and the latter part of ver. 16; but here δέ is a serious obstacle, as its proper force can only be brought out by supplying *although* (De W.) to ver. 15, unless indeed with Alf. we venture on the somewhat doubtful translation ‘nevertheless,’ or fall back [with AD³K; some Vv.; Greek Ff. (*Rec.*)] on the still more doubtful omission.

δικαιοῦται] ‘is justified,’ ‘Deo probatus redditur,’ τὸ δικαιοῦσθαι being in antithesis to τὸ εἰπολεκτοῖς ἀμαρτωλοῖς, ver. 17: see Schott in loc., where the different meanings of δικαιοῦσθαι are explained with great perspicuity. The broad distinction to be observed is between (a) the *absolute* use of the verb, whether with regard to God (Luke vii. 29), Christ (1 Tim. iii. 16), or men (Rom. iv. 2, James ii. 21); and (b) the *relative* use (‘ratione habita’ vel con-

troversiae cui obnoxius fuerit, vel peccatorum quae vere commiserit’). In this latter division we must again distinguish between the purely *judicial* meaning (Matth. xii. 37) and the far wider *dogmatical* meaning, which involves the idea not only of forgiveness of past sins (Rom. vi. 7), but also of a spiritual change of heart through the in-working power of faith. See more in Schott in loc., and in Bull, *Harm. Apost.* Ch. I. § 2 (with Grabe’s notes): and on the whole subject consult *Homily on Salv.* III. 1; Jackson, *Creed*, Book IV. 6, 7; Waterland on *Justif.* Vol. VI. p. 1 sq.; and esp. the admirable explanations and distinctions of Hooker, *Serm.* II. Vol. III. p. 609 sq. (ed. Keble).

ἢ ληγον νόμου] ‘by the works of the law,’ as the cause of the δικαιοῦσθαι. comp. Bull, *Harm. Apost.* Ch. I. § 8, with the notes of Grabe, p. 16 (ed. Burt.). With regard to the exact force of ἐκ it may be observed that in its primary ethical sense it denotes (a) *origin* (more immediate, διὸ more remote); from which it passes through the intermediate ideas of (β) *result from*, and (γ) *consequence of*, to that of (δ) nearly direct *causality* (Rost u. Palm, *Lex.* ἐκ IV. 1), thus closely approximating to ὡρὸ with a gen. (a common use in Herod.) and διὰ with a gen. (Fritz. *Rom.* v. 16, Vol. I. p. 332). In many cases it is hard to decide between these different shades of meaning, especially in a writer so varied in his use of prepp. as St Paul: here however we are guided both by the context and by the analogy of Scripture. From both it seems clear that ἐκ is here used in its simple *causal* sense; the whole object of the speech being to show that the works of the

πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐπιστεύσαμεν, ἵνα δικαιωθῶμεν ἐκ πίστεως Χριστοῦ

16. [Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ] So *Lachm.* and *Tisch.* (ed. 2) with CDEFGKLΝ; majority of mss.; nearly all Vv.; Chrys., Theod., al. The order Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦ, now adopted by *Tisch.* (ed. 7), has only the support of AB; Victorin., August.; (*Lachm.* ed. min.),—external authority insufficient to justify the change. *ἐκ πίστεως Χριστοῦ* *Tisch.* (ed. 2) here omitted Χριστοῦ, with FG; Boern.; Tert., Theod. (1),—but on insufficient external authority, and in opp. to internal arguments; the thrice-repeated *Xp.* in one verse having appy. suggested the omission. In favour of the text are ABCDELΝ; mss.; Clarom., Vulg., al.; Chrys. (2), (*Rec.*, *Griesb.*, *Scholz*, *Lachm.*, *De W.*), and now, rightly, *Tisch.* ed. 7.

law have no ‘causalit̄ *ἐνέργεια*’ in man’s justification. On the contrary, in the antithetical passage in St James (ch. ii. 24), just as δικαιούσθαι has a slightly different (more inclusive) meaning (see Hooker, *Serm.* II. 20), so also has the prep.,—which proportionately recedes from ideas of more *direct* to those of more *remote* causality (*causa sine qua non*); comp. Hamm., *Pract. Catech.* p. 78 (A.-C. L.).

νόμου] Gen. *objecti*: ‘deeds by which the requisitions of the law are fulfilled,’ ‘eorum præstationem quæ lex præcipit’ (Beza),—the בְּרִית מֹשֶׁה of the Rabbinical writers, and the directly antithetical expression to ἀμαρτήματα νόμου, *Wisdom* ii. 12 (Mey.); see exx. in Winer, *Gr.* § 30. 1, p. 167. The νόμος here, it need scarcely be said, is not merely the *ceremonial* (Theod., al.) but the *whole* law,—the Mosaic law in its widest significance; see Fritz. *Rom.* iii. 20, Vol. I. p. 179. ἐάν μή] Two constructions here seem to be blended, οὐ δικ. ἀνθρ. ἐξ ἔργων νόμου, and οὐ δικ. ἀνθρ. ἐάν μή διὰ πίστεως I. X. The two particles, though apparently equivalent in meaning to διλλάδ, never lose their proper *exceptive* force: see Fritz. *Rom.* xiv. 14, Vol. III. p. 195; and notes on ch. i. 7.

διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦν

Χριστοῦ] ‘by faith in, or on, Jesus Christ;’ ‘per fidem in Jesu Christo collocatam.’ Rom. iii. 22. Stier (*Ephes.* Vol. I. p. 447) explains πίστη. ‘Ιησ. Χρ., both here and (esp.) ch. iii. 22, in a deeper sense, ‘faith which belongs to, has its foundation *in Christ*’ (comp. Mark xi. 22, Ephes. iii. 12), the gen. Ιησ. Χρ. being the gen. *subjecti*. This view may deserve consideration in other places, but here certainly the context and preceding antithesis seem decidedly in favour of the more simple gen. *objecti*.

It may be observed that διὰ here closely approximates in meaning to ἐκ below, the same idea of causality being (as Meyer suggests) expressed under two general forms, *origin* and *means*. We must be careful then not to press unduly the distinction between the prepp.: the antithesis is here not so much between the modes of operation, as between the very nature and essence of the principles themselves. As to the doctrinal import of διὰ πίστεως, Waterland (*on Justif.* p. 22) well remarks that ‘faith is not the mean by which grace is wrought or conferred, but the mean whereby it is accepted or received;’ it is ‘the only hand,’ as Hooker appropriately says, ‘which putteth on Christ to justification;’

καὶ οὐκ ἔξ ἔργων νόμου, διότι ἔξ ἔργων νόμου οὐ δικαιώθησται πᾶσα σάρξ. εἰ δὲ ζητοῦντες δικαιωθῆναι ἐν 17

Serm. II. 31: consult also Forbes, *Consid. Mod.* Book I. 3. 10—13.
καὶ τμῆσ] ‘we also;’ *nos etiam quamquam natalibus Iudei, legi Mosis obnoxii:* Schott. *πιστεύσαμεν εἰς Χρ. Ἰησ.]* ‘put our faith in Jesus Christ;’ not ‘have become believers’ (Peile), but simply aoristic, the tense pointing to the particular time when this act of faith was first manifested; see Windischm. *in loc.* In the formula *πιστεύειν εἰς* with acc.—less usual in St Paul’s Epp. (Rom. x. 14, Phil. i. 29), but very common in St John,—the prep. retains its proper force, and marks not the mere direction of the belief (or object *toward* which), but the more strictly theological ideas of *union* and *incorporation with*; comp. notes on ch. iii. 27; Winer, *Gr.* § 31. 5, p. 191; and for the various constructions of *πιστεύω* in the N. T., notes on 1 Tim. i. 16; and Reuss. *Théol. Chrét.* IV. 14, Vol. II. p. 129. The distinction drawn by Alf. between *Xp. Ἰησ.* in this clause and *Ἰησ. Xp.* above seems very precarious, esp. in a passage where there is so much difference of reading. *διότι]* ‘because that,’ ‘propter quod,’ Vulg., *ὅτι* Syr.; scarcely ‘for’ (it is an axiom that), Alf.,—for though *διότι* [properly *quam ob rem*, and then *quoniam*] is often used by later writers in a sense little, if at all, differing from *ὅτι* (see Fritz. *Rom.* i. 19, Vol. I. 57), it does not also appear to be interchangeable with *γάρ*, but always to retain some trace of its proper *causal* force; comp. notes on 1 *Thess.* ii. 8. The reading is doubtful. The text is supported by CD³EKL; very many mss., Vv., and Ff.,—and is perhaps to be preferred, as *ὅτι*

[Lachm. with ABD¹FGN; 5 mss.] seems more probably a correction of the longer *διότι*, than the reverse. *οὐ δικαιωθήσεται κ.τ.λ.]* ‘shall NOT be justified,’ ‘non justificabitur omnis caro,’ Vulg.; Rom. iii. 20, comp. Psalm cxlii. 2, *οὐ δικαιωθήσεται ἐνώπιον σου πᾶς ἄνων* a somewhat expressive Hebraism (see Ewald, *Gr.* p. 657), according to which *οὐ* is to be closely associated with the verb, and the predication regarded as comprehensively and emphatically negative; non-justification is predicated of all flesh: see Winer, *Gr.* § 26. 1, p. 155; Vorst, *de Hebraismis*, p. 519; Fritz. *Rom.* iii. 20, Vol. I. p. 179; and comp. Thol. *Beiträge*, No. 15, p. 79. The future is here *ethical*, i. e. it indicates not so much mere futurity as moral possibility,—and with *οὐ*, something that neither can nor will ever happen: see esp. Thiersch, *de Pent.* III. 11, p. 158 sq., where this and similar uses of the future are well illustrated: comp. Bernhardy, *Synt.* x. 5, p. 377; Winer, *Gr.* § 40. 6, p. 251. On the doctrinal distinctions in St Paul’s Epp. between the pres., perf., and fut. of *δικαιούσθαι* with *πιστις*, see Usteri, *Lehrb.* II. I. 1, p. 90; comp. Peile, *Append.* Vol. II. note D. The order *οὐ δικ. ἔξ ἔργων νομ.* (*Rec.*) is only found in KL; mss.; Goth., al.; Theod. (1), al., and is rejected by all recent critics.

17. *εἰ δέ]* ‘But if, in accordance with these premises of thine, assuming the truth of these thy retrogressive principles,’ *συλλογίζεται τὰ εἰρημένα*. Theod. *[ζητοῦντες] querentes —inventi sumus;* nervosum antitheton: Beng. *ἐν Χριστῷ]* ‘in Christ;’ not ‘through Christ’ (Peile), but ‘in Christ,—in mystical union

**Χριστῷ εὑρέθημεν καὶ αὐτοὶ ἀμαρτωλοί, ἀρα Χριστὸς
18 ἀμαρτίας διάκονος; μὴ γένοιτο. εἰ γὰρ ἂ κατέλυσα**

with him; see Winer, *Gr.* § 48. a, p. 346, note. It is right to notice that this distinction between *ἐν τινι* and *διδ τινες* is strongly opposed by Fritz. (*Opusc.* p. 184, note), and his objections, considered merely grammatically, deserve consideration; but here, as only too often (comp. *Rom.* Vol. II. p. 82 sq.), he puts out of sight the *theological* meaning which appears regularly attached to *ἐν Χριστῷ*. In the present passage the meaning is practically the same, whichever translation be adopted; but in the one the deep significance of the formula (union, fellowship, with Christ) is kept in view, in the other it is obscured and lost sight of; comp. notes on *Eph.* i. 3, ii. 6. *εὑρέθημαν* ‘were found to be, after all our seeking;’ not either a Hebraism, or a periphrasis of the verb substantive (*Kypke, Obs.* Vol. I. p. 2). The verb *εὑρισκ.* has always in the N.T. its proper force, and indicates not merely the existence of a thing, but the manifestation or acknowledgement of that existence; ‘if we are found (deprehendimur) in the eyes of God and men to be sinners;’ comp. *Matth.* i. 18, *Luke* xvii. 18, *Acts* viii. 40, *Rom.* vii. 10, al.; and see esp. Winer in *loc.*, and *Gr.* § 65. 8, p. 542. *καὶ αὐτοῖς* ‘ourselves also,’ as much as those whom we proudly regard only as Gentiles and sinners. *ἀρα]*

‘*ergone?*’ ‘are we to say, as we must on such premises? ironical and interrogative: not *ἀρα* (*Chrys.*, *Ust. al.*); for though in two out of the three passages in which *ἀρα* occurs (*Luke* xviii. 8, *Acts* viii. 30) it anticipates a negative, and not, as here, an affirmative answer, it must still be retained in the present case, as *μὴ γένοιτο* in St Paul’s *Epp.* is never found except

after a question. The particle has here probably an ironical force, ‘are we to say pray?’ i. e. in effect, ‘we are to say, I suppose;’ see Jelf, *Gr.* 873. 2. It is thus not for *δρ' οὐ*—at all times a very questionable position, as in most if not all of such cases it will be found that there is a faint irony or politely assumed hesitation, which seems to have suggested the use of the dubitative *ἀρα*, even though it is obvious that an affirmative answer is fully expected. The same may be said of ‘ne’ for ‘nonne:’ see esp. Kühner, *Xen. Mem.* II. 6, and ib. *Tuscul. Disput.* II. 11, 26; comp. Stalb. *Plato, Rep.* VIII. p. 566 A. The original identity of *δρα* and *ἀρα* (*Klotz, Devar.* Vol. II. p. 180) is impugned (appy. with doubtful success) by Dunbar, *Class. Museum*, Vol. V. p. 102 sq., see Shepherd, ib. Vol. V. p. 470 sq. *ἀμαρτίας διάκονος*] ‘a minister of sin,’ scil. in effect, a promoter, a furtherer of it (comp. 2 Cor. xi. 15), one engaged in its service; *ἀμαρτία* being almost personified, and, as its position suggests, emphatically echoing the preceding *ἀμαρτωλοί*,—‘of sin (not of righteousness),—of a dispensation which not only leaves us where we were before, but causes us, when we exclusively follow it, to be for this very reason accounted sinners.’ *Εἰ δὲ οὗτοι νόμοι καταλιπόντες τῷ Χριστῷ προσεληνθάμεν... παράβασις* [or rather, *ἀμαρτία*] *τούτῳ νερόνισται, εἰς αὐτὸν ἡ ατρία χωρήσει τὸν δεσπότην Χριστὸν Θεον*; comp. *Chrys. in loc.* The argument is in fact a *reductio ad absurdum*: if seeking for justification in Christ is only to lead us to be accounted sinners,—not merely as being without law and in the position of Gentiles (Mey.), but as having wilfully neglected

ταῦτα πάλιν οἰκοδομῶ, παραβάτην ἐμαυτὸν συνιστάνω.

an appointed means of salvation,—then Christ, who was the cause of our neglecting it, must needs be, not only negatively but positively, a minister of sin; see De Wette *in loc.*
μὴ γένοντο] ‘be it not so,’ ‘far be it,’

‘abstain,’ Vulg., ~~πρόπτιος~~ [propitius fuit; comp. Matth. xvi. 22] Syr. *i.e.* in effect (esp. in a context like the present), ‘God forbid.’ Auth. This expressive formula, though not uncommon in later writers (see exx. in Raphel, *Annot.* Vol. II. p. 239, comp. Sturz, *Dial. Maced.* p. 204), only occurs in the N.T. in St Paul’s Epp.; viz. Rom. iii. 4, 6, 31, vi. 2, 15, vii. 7, 13, ix. 14, xi. 1, 11; 1 Cor. vi. 15; Gal. iii. 21. In all these cases it is interjectional, and in all, except the last, rebuts (as Conyb. as remarked) an inference drawn from St Paul’s doctrine by an adversary. The nature of the inference makes the revulsion of thought (*ταχέως διπονηθεῖ*, Dam.) either more or less apparent, and will usually suggest the best mode of translation.

18. *εἰ γάρ*] ‘For if,’ direct confirmation of the immediately preceding *μὴ γένοντο* (Usteri, *Lehrb.* II. 1. 2, p. 162, note), and indirect and allusive expansion of the *εὐρέθημεν ἀμαρτωλοί* ‘I say μὴ γένοντο in ref. to Christ, for it is not in seeking to be justified in Him, but in seeking to rebuild the *same* structure that I have destroyed (though nobler materials now lie around) that my sin, my transgression of the law’s own principles, really lies.’ In the change to the *first* person sing. there *may* be a delicate application to St Peter personally, which ‘clementiae causa’ is expressed in this rather than in the *second* person (Alf., Mey): it must not be forgotten however that the

fervour as well as the introspective character of St Paul’s writings leads him frequently to adopt this *μετασχηματισμὸς εἰς ἔαντρον* see esp. Rom. vii. 7 sq.; so also 1 Cor. iii. 5 sq., iv. 3 sq., vi. 12, x. 29, 30, xiii. 11, 12, *dec.* comp. Knapp, *Scripta Var. Argum.* No. 12, p. 431, 437. ταῦτα]

‘these—and nothing better in their place.’ Meyer. The emphasis rests on *ταῦτα*, not on *ἐμαυτὸν* (Olsch.), the position of which [*παραβ.* *ἐμαυτὸν*, not *ἐμαυτὸν παραβ.*] shows it clearly to be unemphatic.

παραβάτην] ‘a transgressor,’ scil. τοῦ

νόμου. **μέμοντος τοῦ νόμου** [transgressor mandati] Syr. But in what particular manner? Surely not ‘in having formerly neglected what I now reassert’ (De W., Alf.),—a somewhat weak and anticlimactic reference to *εὐρέθημεν διμαρτωλοί*,—but, as the following *γὰρ* and the unfolding argument seem clearly to require, ‘in reconstructing what I ought to perceive is only temporary and preparative.’ Reconstruction of the same materials is, in respect of the law, not only a tacit avowal of an *diapria* (*εὐρέθει*. *diapri*.) in having pulled it down, but is a real and definite *παράβασις* of all its deeper principles. So, very distinctly, Chrys., *ἔκεινοι δεῖξαι ἀβούλοντο ὅτι δὲ μὴ τηρῶν τὸν νόμον παραβάτης οὗτος εἰς τούναντιν περιέτρεψε τὸν λόγον, δεικνὺς ὅτι δὲ τηρῶν τὸν νόμον παραβάτης, οὐ τῆς πίστεως, δλλὰ καὶ αἴσθον τοῦ νόμου.*

The counter-argument that the *I* of ver. 18 has ‘given up’ faith in Christ, and so could never consider the law as preparative (Alf.), is of no real force; for in the first place the ἔγω had not given it up, but had only added to it, and in the next place,

19 ἐγὼ γὰρ διὰ νόμου νόμῳ ἀπέθανον ἵνα Θεῷ ζήσω.

even had he done so, he might equally show himself a *real* though unconscious παραβάτην.

ἔμαντὸν συνιστάνει] ‘set myself forward,’ ‘demonstrate myself to be.’ Hesych. συνιστάνειν ἔπανεῖν, φανεροῦν, βεβαιοῦν, παρατίθεναι. This meaning, ‘sinceris Atticis ignotum,’ Fritz. (*Rom.* iii. 5, Vol. I. p. 159) deduces from the primary notion *componendi*; ‘ut esset συνιστημι τι, compositis collectisque quae rem contineant argumentis aliquid doceo;’ see exx. in Wetst. *Rom.* iii. 5, Schweigh. *Lex. Polyb.* s. v. The form συνιστημι (*Rec.*), only found in D⁸(E?)KL, mss. and Ff., seems a mere grammatical gloss.

19. ἐγὼ γάρ] ‘For I truly.’ explanatory confirmation of the preceding assertion; the explanatory γάρ showing how this rehabilitation of the law actually amounts to a transgression of its true principles, while the emphatic ἐγὼ adds the force and vitality of *personal* experience. In the retrospective reference of παραβάτης adopted by De W. and Alf. (see above) the γάρ loses all its force: it must either be referred, most awkwardly, to μὴ γένοντο (De W.), or, still worse, be regarded as merely transitional.

διὰ νόμου νόμῳ ἀπέθανον] ‘through the law died to the law.’ Of the many explanations of these obscure words the following (derived mainly from Chrysost.) appears by far the most tenable and satisfactory. The result may be summed up in the following positions: (1) Νόμος in each case has the same meaning: (2) That meaning, as the context requires, must be the *Mosaic* law (ver. 16), no grammatical arguments founded on the absence of the article (Middleton in

loc.) having any real validity; comp. exx. in Winer, *Gr.* § 19, p. 112: (3) The law is regarded under the same aspect as in Rom. vii. 6—13, a passage in strictest analogy with the present: (4) Διὰ νόμου must not be confounded with διὰ νόμον or κατὰ νόμον it was through the instrumentality of the law (διὰ τῆς ἐντολῆς, *Rom.* vii. 8) that the sinful principle worked within and brought death upon all: (5) Ἀπέθανον is not merely ‘legi valedixi’ (comp. κατηργήθην ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου), but expresses *generally* what is afterwards more *specifically* expressed in ver. 20 by συνεσταύρωμαι: (6) Νόμῳ is not merely the dative ‘of reference to,’ but a species of ‘*latus commodi*;’ the expressions διὰ τῶν and ἀποθανεῖν τῶν having a wide application; see Fritz. *Rom.* xiv. 7, Vol. III. p. 176;—‘I died not only as concerns the law, but as the law required.’

The whole clause then may thus be paraphrased: ‘*I, through the law, owing to sin, was brought under its curse; but having undergone this with, and in the person of, Christ (ch. iii. 13, comp. 2 Cor. v. 15), I died to the law in the fullest and deepest sense,—being both free from its claims, and having satisfied its curse.*’ The difference between this and the common interpretations lies principally in the fuller meaning assigned to ἀπέθανον, and its reference to συνεσταύρωμαι. A careful investigation will be found in Usteri, *Lehrb.* II. I. 2, p. 164 sq. Ζήσω] ‘may live;’ not a future (Alf.), —an anomalous usage (see notes on ver. 4) which it is surely unnecessary to obtrude on the present passage—but the regular *aor. subj.* (1 Thess. v. 10), the tense of the dependent clause being in idiomatic accordance with

Χριστῷ συνεσταύρωμαι. ζῶ δὲ οὐκέτι ἐγώ, ζῇ δὲ ἐν ἑμοὶ Χριστός· ὃ δὲ νῦν ζῶ ἐν σαρκὶ, ἐν πίστει ζῶ τῇ

that of the leading member; comp. Schmalfeld, *Synt.* § 144. I, p. 296.

20. **Χριστῷ συνεστ.**] 'I have been and am crucified with Christ;' more exact specification of the preceding *ἀπέθανον*. This *συνεσταύρω*, it need scarcely be said, did not consist merely in the crucifixion of the lusts (ch. v. 24, Grot.), but in that union with Christ according to which the believer shares the death of his crucified Lord; ἐπειδὴ ἐν τῷ βαπτίσματι τοῦ τε θαράτου καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως τύπον ἐπλήρων, συνταυροῦσθαι ἐλέγοντο τῷ Χριστῷ. Theod.-Mops. *in loc.* [ἴω δὲ οὐκέτι ἐγώ] 'I live however no longer myself,' i.e. my old self; see Rom. vi. 6, and comp. Neand. *Plant.* Vol. I. p. 422 (Bohn). The familiar but erroneous punctuation of this clause (ζῶ δὲ, οὐκέτι ἐγώ, ζῇ δὲ κ.τ.λ.) has been rightly rejected by all recent editors except Scholz. The only passing difficulty is in the use of δὲ: it does not simply continue (Rückert, Peile) or expand (Ust.) the meaning of Χρ. *συνεστ.*, but reverts with its proper adversative force to ἡν Θεῷ γένος, *συνεστ.* being not so much a link in the chain of thought, as a rapid and almost parenthetical exegesis of *ἀπέθανον*.

[ζῇ δὲ] The δὲ does not introduce any opposition to the preceding negative clause (it would then be δλλδ), but simply marks the emphatic repetition of the same verb (Hartung, *Partik.* δὲ, 2. 17, Vol. I. p. 168), just retaining however that *sub-adversative* force which is so common when a clause is added, expressing a new, though not a dissimilar thought; see Klotz, *Devar.* Vol. II. p. 361. On the doctrinal import of ζῇ ἐν ἐμοὶ Χρ. ('Christ and His Spirit dwelling in

them, and as the soul of their souls moving them unto such both inward and outward actions as in the sight of God are acceptable;') see Hooker, *Serm.* III. I, Vol. III. p. 764 sq. (ed. Keble). δὲ νῦν [ζῇ] 'yes, the life which now I live,' explanatory and partially concessive clause, obviating the possible objection arising from the seeming incompatibility of the assertion ζῇ ἐν ἐμοὶ Χρ. with the fact of the actual ζῆν ἐν σαρκὶ 'it is true,' says the Apostle, 'I do yet live in the flesh, an earthly atmosphere is still around me, but even thus I live and breathe in the pure element of faith, —faith in Him who loved me, yea and (καὶ) gave such proofs of His love.'

With regard to the construction it is only necessary to observe that δ is not 'quod attinet ad id quod' (Winer), but simply the accus. *objecti* after ζῶ, scil. τὴν δὲ ζωὴν ἣν νῦν ζῶ· comp. Rom. vi. 10, δ γάρ ἀπέθανεν, and see Fritz. *in loc.* Vol. I. p. 393.

δὲ is thus not merely continuative (De W.), but serves both to limit and explain the preceding words (comp. 1 Cor. i. 16, and Winer, *Gr.* § 53. 7. b, p. 393), its true opposite force being sufficiently clear when the suppressed thought (see below) is properly supplied: see Klotz, *Devar.* Vol. II. p. 366.

[νῦν] The reference of this particle is doubtful. It may specify the period since the Apostle's conversion, but is much more plausibly referred by Chrys., Theod., al. to the present life in the flesh, 'haec vita mea terrena'; see Phil. i. 22. In the former case the qualitative and tacitly contrasting σαρκὶ ('earthly existence,' 'life in the phenomenal world,' *αἰσθητὴ ζωὴ*, Chrys.; comp. Müller, *on Sin*, Vol. I.

τοῦ νιοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ, τοῦ ἀγαπήσαντός με καὶ παραδόντος ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ. οὐκ ἀθετῶ τὴν χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰ γὰρ διὰ νόμου δίκαιοσύνη, ἀρά Χριστὸς δωρεὰν ἀπέθανεν.

p. 453, Clark) would seem wholly superfluous.

[ἐν πίστει]
‘in faith.’ The instrumental sense, ‘by faith,’ adopted by Theodoret and several ancient as well as modern expositors, is, though inexact, not grammatically untenable. The deeper meaning of the words is however thus completely lost. On this ‘life in faith’ see the middle and latter portion of a profound paper, ‘Bemerk. zum Begriffe der Religion,’ by Lechler, *Stud. u. Kritik.* for 1851, Part IV.

τῇ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ] ‘namely that of the Son of God;’ distinctive, and with solemn emphasis,—the insertion of the article serving both to specify and to enhance, ‘in fide, eaque Filii Dei’ (see notes on 1 Tim. iii. 13, and on 2 Tim. i. 13), while the august title, by intimating the true fountain of life (John v. 26), tends to add confirmation and assurance; *ὅταν περὶ τοῦ Τίοῦ νοεῖν ἔθελης, μαθὼν τίνα ἔτι τὰ ἐν τῷ Πατρὶ, ταῦτα καὶ ἐν τῷ Τίῳ εἰναι πίστεν;* Athan. on Matth. xi. 27, Vol. I. p. 153 (ed Bened.).

The reading of Lachm. *τῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Χριστοῦ, τοῦ δύας.* is supported by BD'FG; Clarom.,—but has every appearance of being a gloss; see Meyer (critical notes), p. 29.

καὶ παραδόντος κ.τ.λ.] ‘and (as a proof of his love) gave Himself; &c. the *καὶ* being ἐξηγητικόν, and illustratively subjoining the practical proof; see Fritz. Rom. ix. 23, Vol. II. p. 339, and on this and other uses of *καὶ*, notes on Phil. iv. 12.

ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ] ‘for me,’ ‘pro me,’ Vulg.; to atone for me and to save me. On the dogmatical meaning of this prep.,

see notes on ch. iii. 13.

21. *οὐκ ἀθετῶ*] ‘I do not make void,’ ‘nullify;’ not ‘non abjicio,’ Vulg., still less *οὐκ ἀτιμάζω*, Theod.,—but ‘non irritam facio, ut dicam per legem esse justitiam,’ Aug. *in loc.*; comp. 1 Cor. i. 19, *τὴν σύνεσιν τῶν συνετῶν ἀθετήσω* ch. iii. 15, (διαθήκην) *ἀθετεῖ*: so 1 Macc. xv. 27, *ἡθέτησε πάντα δοτὰ συνέθετο αὐτῷ* and frequently in Polyb., see Schweigh. *Lex.* s. v. The verb is sometimes found in the milder sense of ‘despising,’ ‘rejecting,’ &c. with persons (Luke x. 16, John xii. 48, 1 Thess. iv. 8); but this obviously falls short of the meaning in the present context.

τὴν χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ] ‘the grace of God,’ as shown in the death of Christ and our justification by faith in Him; not, ‘the Gospel,’ as Hamm. *on Heb.* xiii. 9.

In our justification, as it is well said in the *Homilies*, there are three things which go together,—on God’s part His mercy and grace; upon Christ’s part the satisfaction of God’s justice; and upon our part true and lively faith in the merits of Jesus Christ: *On Salvat.* Part I.

ὑπὸ explains and confirms the preceding declaration; ‘I say *οὐκ ἀθετῶ*, for it is an immediate inference that if the law could have been the medium of δικαιοσύνη Christ’s death would have been purposeless.’

διὰ νόμου ‘by means of the law’ as a medium of δικαιοσύνη emphatic, as the position shows, and antithetical to Χριστὸς in the succeeding clause. In the present verse it is in effect asserted that the νόμος is not a medium of δικαιοσύνη (*eis κτῆσιν δικαιοσύνης*

O foolish Galatians is not the Spirit which ye have received an *σκανεν*, οἵς κατ' ὁφθαλμοὺς Ἰησοῦς Χρι-
evidence that justifi-
cation is by faith, and not by the works of the law?

δρκεῖ? Theod.), in ch. iii. 11, it is asserted not to be the *sphere* of it, and in ch. iii. 21, not the *origin*. δι-

καιοσύνην] 'righteousness,' [λόγοι]

Syr., 'justitia,' Vulg.; not equivalent to *δικαιωσίς* (Whately, *Dangers*, &c. § 4), nor yet, strictly considered, the result of it; but appy. in the most inclusive meaning of the term—*righteousness*, whether imputed, by which we are accounted *δικαιοι*, or infused and inherent, by which we could be found so; see Hooker, *Serm. II. 3, 21*, where the distinction between justifying and sanctifying righteousness is drawn out with admirable perspicuity. On the meaning of the word, see Andrewes, *Serm. v. Vol. v. p. 114 (A.-C. L.)*; Waterland, *Justif. Vol. vi. p. 4*; and for some acute remarks on its lexical aspects, Knox, *Remains*, Vol. II. p. 276. δρα] 'then,' i. e. 'the obvious inference is.' On the meaning of *δρα*, see notes, ch. v. 11. δεσπόιν] 'for naught, without cause;' not here 'frustra' (Grot.), 'sine effectu,'—but 'sine justa causa,' Tittm. *Synon. I. p. 161*; περιττὸς δ τοῦ Χριστοῦ θνήσκως Chrys.; 'superflue mortuus est Chr.', Jerome: comp. John xv. 25, ἐμοιησάν με δωρέω' Psalm xxxiv. (xxxv.) 7, δωρέαν (dowrius, Symm.). ἔκρηψεν μοι διαφθόρως. So δῆλον, which the LXX frequently translate by δωρέω, has the meaning 'in nullum bonum finem,' as well as 'gratis' and 'frustra:' comp. Gesen. *Lex. s. v.*; Vorst, *de Hebraism. VII. 6*, p. 228, 229.

CHAPTER III. I. δυνάγοτοι Γαλ.] 'foolish Galatians;' fervid and indig-
nant application of the results of the

preceding demonstration to the case of his readers. The epithet δυνάγοτος is used in three other passages by St Paul,—Rom. i. 14, opp. to σφόδρος· I Tim. vi. 9, joined with βλαβερός· Tit. iii. 3, with διειθῆς and πλανώμενος—and in all seems to mark not so much a dulness in ('insensati,' Vulg.), as a deficiency in, or rather an insufficient application of, the νοῦς·

comp. Syr. [لَمْ يَنْتَهِ بِشَيْءٍ]

[destituti mente], and Luke xxiv. 25, where while βραδὺς τῇ καρδίᾳ denotes the defect in heart, δυνάγοτος seems to mark the defect in head; comp. Tittm. *Synon. I. p. 144*, where this word is defined somewhat artificially, but rightly distinguished from δρόμως and δούλερος which seem to point respectively rather to 'senselessness' and 'slowness of understanding.'

It cannot then be asserted (Brown) that the Galatians were proverbially stupid; comp. Callim. *H. Del. 184*, δόρων φύλων. Themistius, who himself spent some time in the (then extended, Forbig. *Geogr. Vol. II. p. 364*) province gives them a very different character: οἱ δὲ δύρδες λοτε δτι δξεῖς καὶ δγχνοι καὶ εἰμαθέστεροι τῷ δγαν 'Ἐλλήνων' καὶ τριβωλου ταραφαντος ἐκκρέμαται εδθίς, οὐτερ τῆς λίθου τὰ σιδήρα. *Orat. 23, ad fin. p. 299 (ed. Harduin)*. Versatility and inconstancy, as the Epistle shows (comp. notes on ch. i. 6), were the true characteristics of the Galatian. Foolishness must have been often, as in the present case, not an unnatural concomitant.

δυνάγεσθαι] 'did bewitch you,' 'vos fascinavit,' Vulg., Clarom. The verb βασκάνω is derived from βάσκω (Pott. *Etym. Foresch. Vol. I. p.*

2 στὸς προεγράφη ἐν ὑμῖν ἐσταυρωμένος; τοῦτο μόνον

271), and perhaps signified originally ‘malā lingua nocere;’ comp. Benfey, *Wurzellex.* Vol. II. p. 104. Here however the reference appears rather to the bewitching influence of the evil eye (comp. Eccl. xiv. 8, βασκανῶν δῆθαλμῶν, and see Elsner in loc., Winer, *RWB. Art.* ‘Zauberei’), though not necessarily ‘the evil eye of envy,’ (Chrys.; comp. Syr. *λαζα*)

as in this latter sense βασκ. is commonly with a *dat.* (but in Eccl. xiv. 6, Ignat. *Rom.* 3, with *accus.*): see Lobeck, *Phryn.* p. 462; Pierson, *Herodian.* p. 470. The addition, *τὴν ἀληθείᾳ μὴ τελθεσθαι* [Rec. with CD³E⁹KL; mss.; Vulg. (but not all mss.), Syr.-Philox., AEth. (both), al.; Ath., Theod.], is rightly rejected by most modern editors, both as deficient in external authority [omitted in ABD¹EFGN; 2 mss.; Syr., and nearly all Vv.], and as an apparent gloss from ch. v. 7. προεγράφη] ‘was openly set forth,’ ‘præscriptus est,’ Vulg., Clarom. The meaning of this word has been much discussed. The ancient (comp. Syr.) and popular gloss is ἔγραψθε (Theoph., Εcum., and appy. Chrys., Theod.), but without any lexical authority; for common as is the use of γράφω in a pictorial sense, there appears no certain instance of προ γράφω being ever so used: see Rettig, *Stud. u. Krit.* 1830, p. 96 sq. We can then only safely translate προεγράφη either (a) ‘antea scriptus est,’ or (β) ‘palam scriptus est.’ Between these it is difficult to decide. Considered *lexically* (a) seems the most probable; for though (β) is appy. the more common meaning in Hellenic writers (Plutarch, *Camill.* § 11, comp. Polyb. *Hist.* XXXII. 21. 12, al.), yet in the three other passages in

the N.T. in which προεγράφω occurs, viz. Rom. xv. 4, Eph. iii. 3, Jude 4, it is used in the former sense. Both meanings occur in the LXX: (a) in 1 Esdr. vi. 32 (*Ald.*); (β) in 1 Macc. x. 36. Contextual considerations however seem in favour of (β); as this meaning not only harmonizes best with the prominent and purely local καὶ δῆθαλμοῖς (comp. καὶ δύματα, Soph. *Antig.* 756), but also best illustrates the peculiar and suggestive ἔβασκανε, which thus gains great force and point; ‘who could have bewitched you by his gaze, when you had only to fix your eyes on Christ to escape the fascination?’ comp. Numb. xxi. 9. ἐν ὑμῖν ‘among you;’ not a Hebraistic pleonasm (‘construi debet ἐν οἷς ὑμῖν’ Grot.), but a regular local predicate appended to προεγράφη, and appy. intended to enhance the preceding οἷς καὶ δῆθ. by a still more studied specification of place: not only had the truth been presented to them, but preached among them with every circumstance of individual and local exhibition. According to the usual connexion ἐν ὑμῖν is joined with ἐσταυρ. (com. Chrys.), but in that case both perspicuity and emphasis would have required the order ἐσταυρ. ἐν ὑμῖν, while in the present the isolation of ἐσταυρ. is in accordance with the natural order, and adds greatly to the pathos and emphasis; see 1 Cor. i. 23, and comp. 1 Cor. ii. 2. On the force of the perf. part. as implying the permanent character of the action, see Winer, *Gr.* § 45. 1, p. 305; Green, *Gr.* p. 308. It may be observed that Lachm. (*Griesb.* marks with ^{oo}) omits ἐν ὑμῖν with ABCN; 10 mss.; Amit., Tol., Syr., al.; but with little probability, as the omission of such a seemingly

θέλω μαθεῖν ἀφ' ὑμῶν, ἐξ ἔργων νόμου τὸ Πνεῦμα ἐλάβετε ἢ ἐξ ἀκοῆς πίστεως; οὐτως ἀνόητοι ἔστε; 3 ἐναρξάμενοι Πνεύματι νῦν σαρκὶ ἐπιτελεῖσθε; τοσαῦτα 4

superfluous clause can easily be accounted for, but not the insertion.

2. *τεῦτο μόνον* ‘This only,’—not to mention other arguments which might be derived from your own admissions; ‘de eo quod promptum est sciscitor’ Jerome. *μαθεῖν ἀφ' ὑμῶν*] ‘to learn of you,’ Auth. Ver.; not for *ταῦτα ὑμῶν* (Rück.), which would imply a more immediate and direct communication, but with the proper force of *ἀφ'*, which as a general rule (Col. i. 7, seems an exception) indicates a source less active and more remote: contrast 2 Tim. iii. 14, and see Winer, Gr. § 47, *ἀφ'*, p. 331 note; comp. also notes on ch. i. 12. For exx. of this use of *μαθεῖν*, not ‘to learn as a disciple,’ with an ironical reference (Luth., Beng.), but simply ‘to arrive at a knowledge,’ see exx. in Rost u. Palm, *Lex. s. v.*, and comp. Acts xxiii. 27.

τὸ Πνεῦμα] ‘the Spirit,’ *τὴν τοσαύτην λογίν* Chrys.; ‘de Spiritu miraculorum loqui hic apostolum patet.’ Bull, *Harm. Ap.* Part II. 11. 8. It is not however necessary to understand this as the exclusive meaning, much less to explain it with Baur, *Apost. Paulus*, p. 515, as ‘das Christliche Bewusstseyn;’ see next verse. *ἀκοής πίστεως* may be translated, either (a) ‘the hearing of faith,’ i.e. the reception of the Gospel (Brown); or (β) ‘the report or message of faith,’ i.e. the preaching which related to, had as its subject, *πίστις* (gen. *objecti*); according as *ἀκοή* is taken in an active or pass. sense. The former might seem to preserve a better antithesis to *ἔργων νόμου*,—‘hearing the doctrine of faith, opp. to doing the works of

the law’ (Schott, Peile; comp. *AEth.*), but is open to the decided *lexical* objection that *ἀκοή* appears always used in the N.T. in a passive sense (so both in Rom. x. 17, where see Fritz; and in 1 Thess. ii. 13, where see notes), and to the *contextual* objection that the real opposition is not between the doing and the hearing, but between the two principles, faith and the law,—the question in effect being, δι νόμος ὑμῖν ἔδωκεν τοῦ θεοῦ Πνεῦματος ἐνέργειας, η μόνη ἡ ἐπὶ τὸν Κύριον πίστις; Theod. We may then with some confidence adopt (β); so Goth. (‘gahauseins’), Arm., and recently De W., Mey., and the best modern commentators.

3. *οὐτως δινόητοι*] ‘to so high a degree, so very foolish,’—with reference to what follows: ‘quum oītōs cum adjectivo nomini aut adverbio copulatur, reddes non solum ‘ita,’ ‘adeo,’ verum etiam ‘usque adeo;’’ Steph. *Thesaur.* s. v. Vol. V. p. 2433, where several exx. are cited; e.g. Isoc. *Paneg.* 43 d, οītō μεγδλας· Xen. *Cyr.* II. 2, 16, οītō πολέμων.

ἐναρξάμενοι] ‘after having begun,’ temporal participle referring to the previous fact of their first entrance into Christian life. On the temporal force of the participle, see notes on *Eph.* iv. 8 (ed. 2); and on the force of the compound (more directly concentrated action), see notes on *Phil.* i. 6.


Πνεῦματι] ‘with the

Spiritu; dat. of the manner (*modal* dat.) in which the action took place: see Winer, Gr. § 31. 6, p. 193; Bernhardy, *Synt.* III. 14, p. 100; Jelf, Gr. § 603. The meaning of *πνεῦμα* and *σάρξ* in this verse has been the subject

5 ἐπάθετε ἐικῆ; εἰ γε καὶ εἰκῆ. ὁ οὖν ἐπιχορηγῶν ὑμῖν

of considerable discussion. Of the earlier expositors, Theodoret paraphrases πν. by ἡ χάρις, σάρξ by ἡ καὶ νόμον τολμεία (so Waterl. *Distinct. of Sacr.* II. § 10, Vol. v. p. 262), while Chrys. finds in σάρξ a definite allusion to the circumcision; comp. Eph. ii. 11. *Alii alia.* The most satisfactory view is that taken by Müller, *Doct. of Sin*, ch. 2, Vol. I. 355 sq. (Clark),—viz. that when πνέωμα is thus in ethical contrast with σάρξ it is to be understood of the *Holy Spirit*, regarded as the governing and directing principle in man; σάρξ, on the contrary, as *the worldly tendency of human life*, ‘the life and movement of man in things of the phenomenal world.’ If this be correct πν. and σάρξ are here used, not to denote Christianity and Judaism *per se*, but as it were the essence and active principle of each.

ἐντελέσθε] ‘are ye brought to completion?’ Not middle, as often in Hellenic Greek (see Schweig. *Lex. Polyb.* s.v.), but *passive* (Vulg., Clarom., Chrys.), as in 1 Pet. v. 9, comp. Phil. i. 6. The meaning of the compound must not be neglected; it does not merely imply ‘finishing’ (Ust., Peile) as opposed to ‘beginning,’ but appears always to involve the idea of bringing to a *complete* and *perfect* end; comp. 1 Sam. iii. 12, ἀρξομαι καὶ ἐντελέσω: see further exx. in Bretsch. *Lex.* s.v., and the good collection in Rost u. Palm, *Lex. s.v.* Vol. I. p. 1123, —the most definite of which seems, Herod. ix. 64, ἡ δίκη τοῦ φόνου...ἐκ Μαρδονίου ἐπενελέπετο.

4. *ἐπάθετε]* ‘Did ye suffer?’ ‘passi-
estis,’ Vulg., Clarom.,  [sustiniuitis] Syr., ΖΕΘ. (both). The meaning of this word has been much discussed. The apparent tenor of the

argument, as alluding rather to benefits than to sufferings, has led Kypke (*Obs. Vol. II.* p. 277, comp. Schoettg. *Hor. Hebr. Vol. I.* p. 731) and others to endeavour to substantiate by exx. that πάσχειν is not only a word of neutral meaning, but, even without εὖ or δυσθέν, actually signifies ‘*beneficiis affici*,’—a usage however of which Steph. (*Thes. s. v.*) rightly says ‘exemplum desidero.’ For the *neutral* meaning (‘*experienced*,’ ed. 1), as including a reference to all the spiritual dispensations, whether sufferings or blessings, which had happened to (Arm.) or had been vouchsafed to the Galatians, much may be said both lexically and contextually,—still, on the one hand, the absence of any *direct* instance in the N. T. [even in Mark v. 26, there is an idea of suffering in the background], and, on the other, the authority of the ancient Vv. and Greek expositors lead us *now* to revert to the regular meaning, *suffered*, and to refer it to the labours (Copt.) and persecutions which in one form or other must have certainly tried the early converts of Galatia; see Chrys., Jerome, and the good note of Alford *in loc.* All these sufferings were a genuine evidence of the ἐναρξάμενος Πνεύματι, and would be regarded and alluded to by the Apostle as blessed tokens of the Spirit’s influence; comp. 1 Thess. ii. 13, 14, and the remarks of August. *in h. l.* εἰ γε καὶ εἰκῆ] ‘if indeed, or if at least, it really be in vain.’ The sense of this clause has been obscured by not attending to the true force of εἰ γε and καὶ. εἰ γε must not be confounded with εἰ τερ (Tholuck, *Beiträge*, p. 146): the latter, in accordance with the extensive, or perhaps rather intensive force of τερ (Donalds. *Crat.* § 178, comp.

τὸ Πνεῦμα καὶ ἐνεργῶν δυνάμεις ἐν ὑμῖν, ἐξ ἔργων νόμου η ἐξ ἀκοῆς πίστεως;

Klotz, *Devar.* Vol. II. p. 723), implies 'si omnino,' the former (*εἴτε*), in accordance with the restrictive *γέ*, is 'si quidem,' and if resolved, *tum certe si*; ('*γέ* its tantummodo ad tollendam conditionem facit, quia *tum certe si* *quid stat, aliud esse* significat, non ut ipsam conditionem confirmet.' Klotz, *Devar.* Vol. II. p. 308), comp. p. 528. No inference however of the Apostle's real opinion can be drawn merely from the *γέ* 'usurpat de re que jure sumpta creditur' (Herm. *Vig.* No. 310), as it is the sentence and not the particle which determines the rectitude of the assumption. *καὶ* must closely be joined with *εἰτί*, and either (a), with its usual *ascensive* force ('quasi ascensionem ad eam rem quo pertinet particula'; Klotz, *Devar.* Vol. II. p. 638), gives to the clause the meaning, 'if at least it amount to, i. e. be really in vain;' or (b), with what may be termed its *descensive* force (*Odyss.* I. 58, see Hartung, *Partik.* *καὶ*, § 2. 8, Vol. I. p. 136), serves to imply, 'if at least it be only in vain, i. e. has not proceeded to a more dangerous length,' videndum ne ad perniciem valeat: Aug. *in loc.*, Coccinius. Of these (b) is the most emphatic and pungent (so Mey., De W.), but (a) most characteristic of the large heart of the Apostle, and of the spirit of love and tenderness to his converts (ch. iv. 19) which is blended even with the rebukes of this Epistle; so Chrys., and the Greek expositors; comp. Brown, p. 112.

5. δ οὐν ἐπιχορηγῶν] 'He then who is bestowing, &c.' resumption by means of the reflexive *οὐν* (see below, and notes on *Phil.* ii. 1) of the subject of ver. 2; ver. 3 and 4 being in effect parenthetical. The subject of

this verse is not St Paul (Lomb., Erasm., al.), but, as the context, the meaning of *δυνάμεις*, the nature of the action specified (*ἐπιχορηγῶν*), and the permanence of the action implied by the present tense *ἐπιχορηγῶν* (comp. Winer, *Gr.* § 45. 1, p. 304; Schmal-field, *Synt.* § 202, p. 405), all obviously suggest,—God: δ Θεός, φησι, δ ἐπιχορηγῶν ὑμῖν τὸ Πνεῦμα: Theoph. The force of *ἐπι* in *ἐπιχορ.* does not appear *additive*, but *directive* (see Rost u. Palm, *Lex.* s. v., and *ib.* s. v. *ἐπι*, C. 3. cc), any idea of the freedom or ample nature of the gift (Winer, Peile) being due solely to the primary meaning of the simple verb: see notes on *Col.* ii. 19, and comp. 2 Cor. ix. 10, where both *χορηγέω* and *ἐπιχορηγέω* occur in the same verse, and appy. in the same sense *quantitatively* considered. For exx. of the use of *ἐπιχορ.* in later writers see the collection of Hase, in Steph. *Thes.* s. v. Vol. III. p. 1902. On the present resumptive use of *οὖν* after a (logical) parenthesis, which has been incorrectly pronounced rare in Attic writers, see Klotz, *Devar.* Vol. II. p. 718; Hartung, *Partik.* *οὖν*, 3. 5, Vol. II. p. 22. It may be remarked that as a general rule *οὖν* is *continuative* and *retrospective* rather than *illative*, and is in this respect to be distinguished from *ἀλλα* (Donalds. *Gr.* § 604), but it must not also be forgotten that as in the N. T. the use of *οὖν* is to that of *ἀλλα* nearly as 11 to 1, the force of the former particle must not be unduly restricted. In St Paul's Epp. where the proportion is not quite 4 to 1, the true distinction between the two particles may be more safely maintained; see however notes on 1 Tim. ii. 1 (*Transl.*).

6 Καθὼς Ἀβραὰμ ἐπίστευσεν τῷ As Abraham was justified by faith; so shall his spiritual children be justified, and share his blessing.
 Θεῷ, καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην
 7 νην. γινώσκετε ἄρα ὅτι οἱ ἐκ πίστεως, οὗτοί εἰσιν νιόι

θυνάμας] ‘miraculous powers,’ 

[virtutes] Syr., ‘virtutes,’ Vulg., Clarom. This more restricted meaning, which may be supported by 1 Cor. xii. 28, and probably Matth. xiv. 2, seems best to accord with the context. Kai is then ἔξηγητικόν, and ἐν ὑμῖν retains its natural meaning with ἐνεργέω, ‘in you,’ ‘within you;’ comp. Matth. l.c., αἱ δυνάμεις ἐνεργοῦσιν ἐν αὐτῷ.

ἐξ ἤργουν νόμου] ‘from the works of the law;’ not exactly ‘as following upon,’ Alf. (bis); but, in more strict accordance with the primary force of the prep., ‘from,’ ‘out of’ (‘ex,’ Vulg.), as the originating or moving cause of the ἐπιχορήγησις’ comp. notes on ch. ii. 16.

6. καθὼς] ‘Even as.’ The answer is so obvious, that St Paul proceeds as if it had been expressed. The compound particle καθὼς is not found in the purer Attic authors, though sufficiently common in later writers; see exx. collected by Lobeck, *Phryn.* p. 426. Em. Moschop., the Byzantine Grammarians, cited by Fabricius, *Bibl. Graeca*, Vol. VI. p. 191 (ed. Harles), remarks that this is an Alexandrian usage; τὸ καθὸς οἱ Ἀττικοὶ χρῶνται, τὸ δὲ καθὼς οὐδέποτε, δλλ' ἡ τῶν Ἀλεξανδρέων διδλεκτος καθὸς ἦν ή θελαγραφὴ γέγραπται’ see esp. Sturz de *Dialecto Maced.* § 9, s. v. (Steph. *Thes.* ed. Valpy, p. clxx). On the most suitable translation, comp. notes on 1 *Thess.* i. 5 (*Transl.*).

ἴλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην] ‘it was accounted for to him, or was reckoned to him, as righteousness,’ scil. τὸ πιστεύσας see Winer, Gr. § 49. 2, p. 427 (ed. 5). The phrase λογίσεται

τι εἰς τι, *Acts* xix. 27, *Rom.* ii. 26, iv. 3, ix. 8, is explained by Fritzsche (*Rom.* Vol. I. p. 137), as equivalent to λογίσεται τι εἰς τὸ εἶναι τι, ‘ita res estimatur ut res sit, h. e. ut pro re valeat;’ hence ‘tribuitur alicui rei vis ac pondus rei.’ In such cases, the more exact idea conveyed by εἰς of destination for any object or thing (Rost u. Palm, *Lex.* s. v. εἰς, v. 1) is blended with that of simple predication of it. In later writers this extended so far that εἰς is often used as a mere index of the accus., having lost all its prepositional force; e. g. δύεται εἰς γυναῖκα’ see Bernh. *Synt.* v. II. b. 2, p. 219. With the present semi-Hebraistic use of λογίζεται, εἰς, it is instructive to contrast Xen. *Cyr.* III. I. 33, χρήματα...εἰς ἀργύριον λογισθέντα where εἰς has its primary ethical meaning of measure, accordance to.

On the doctrinal meaning of ἐλογίσθη κ.τ.λ. see Bull, *Harm. Apost.* II. 12. 22; and for an able comparison of the faith of Abraham with that of Christians, Hammond, *Pract. Catech.* Book I. 3.

7. γνώσκετε ἄρα] ‘Know ye therefore,’ Κατα? [cognoscite] Syr., Vulg., Clarom., Armen.—not indicative, as Jerome, Ps.-Ambr. al., and most recently Alf.: the imper. is not only more animated, but more logically correct, for the declaration in the verse is really one of the points which the Apostle is labouring to prove; ἐν κεφαλαίῳ διδόσκει τὸν Ἀβραὰμ ἐκ πιστεως δικαιωθέντα, καὶ τὸν τροφίμους τῆς πιστεως νιόν τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ χρηματίζων’ Theod.; see Olsh. in loc. The objections of Rück., and even of

Ἄβραάμ. προϊδούσα ὅτε ή γραφὴ ὅτι ἐκ πίστεως δι- 8
καὶ τὰ ἔθνη ὁ Θεός, προευηγγελίσατο τῷ Ἀβραὰμ

Alf., to the use of *δι* with the imper. are distinctly invalid: not only is the union of the imper. with *δι* logically admissible, and borne out by usage (comp. Hom. *Il.* x. 249), but further, in perfect harmony with the true lexical force of the particle: ‘*rebus ita comparatis* (Abraham’s faith being reckoned to him as righteousness) *cognoscite, &c.*;’ see Klotz, *Devar.* Vol. II. p. 167.

οἱ ἐκ πίστεως]

‘they who are of faith,’ not ‘they who rest on faith’ (Green, *Gr.* p. 288), but, in accordance with the primary meaning of *origin*, ‘they who are spiritually descended from, whose source of spiritual life is—πίστις’ compare Rom. ii. 8, οἱ ἐξ ἐριθεᾶς, ‘qui a malarum fraudum machinatione originem ducunt,’ ‘qui malitiam tanquam parentem habent.’ Fritz, *in loc.*, Vol. I. p. 105.

οὗτοι] ‘these, and none other than these,’ ‘exclusis ceteris Abrahamatis.’ Beng.; see James i. 25. This retrospective and emphatic use of the pronoun is illustrated by Winer, *Gr.* § 23. 4, p. 144: see also Bernhardy, *Synt.* vi. 8. d, p. 283; Jelf, *Gr.* § 658.

8. προϊδούσα δὲ ή γραφῇ] ‘Moreover the Scripture foreseeing.’ further statement that the faithful, who have already been shown to be the true children of Abraham, are also the only and proper participators in his blessing. This sort of personification is noticed by Schoettg. (*Hor. Hebr.* Vol. I. p. 732) as a ‘formula Iudeis admodum solemnis,’ e. g. פָּנָא הַנִּצְחָה בְּהַתְּבִדֵּל ‘Quid vidit scriptura?’ חַנְאָה הַנִּצְחָה בְּהַתְּבִדֵּל ‘Quid vidit ille, h. e. quid nam ipsi in mentem venit?’ see also Surenhus, *Bibl. Karaall.* p. 6 sq. In such cases ή γραφῇ stands obviously for the Author of the Scriptures—

God, by whose inspiration they were written: comp. Syr., where Ἰσλῆ [Aloho] is actually adopted in the translation. Εἶ appears to be here μεταβατικόν, i. e. indicative of transition (Hartung, *Partik.* δέ, 2, 3, Vol. I. p. 165; Winer, *Gr.* § 53. 7. b, p. 393): it does not merely connect this verse with the preceding (Auth.-Ver., Peile, Conyb., al.), but implies a further consideration of the subject under another aspect; ‘δέ eam ipsam vim habet ut abducat nos ab εἴ re quae proposita est, transferatque ad id quod missa illa priore re jam pro vero ponendum esse videatur.’ Klotz, *Devar.* Vol. II. p. 353. The exact force of δέ, which is never simply connective (Hartung, *Partik.* Vol. I. p. 163), and never loses all shades of its true oppositional character, deserves almost more attentive consideration in these Epp. than any other particle, and will often be found to supply the only true clue to the sequence and evolution of the argument.

δικαιετ] ‘justifieth,’ not ‘would justify,’ Auth. (‘presentes pro futuro,’ Grot.), nor present with ref. to what is now taking place (De W.), but what is termed the *ethical* present, with significant reference to the eternal and immutable counsels of God; δικαιεταῦτα καὶ ἀρισταῖς καὶ προηγόρευσεν ὁ Θεός. Theod.: comp. Matth. xxvi. 2, παραδίδοται; see Winer, *Gr.* § 40. 2, p. 237, and for the rationale of this usage, Schmalfeld, *Synt.* § 54. 2, p. 91.

προευηγγελίσατο] ‘made known the glad tidings beforehand;’ comp. Gen. xii. 3, xviii. 18, xxii. 18. The compound προευαγγ. is somewhat rare; it occurs in Schol. Soph. *Trach.* 335; Philo, *De Opif.* § 9, Vol. I. p. 7, *D*,

9 ὅτι ἐνευλογηθήσονται ἐν σοὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη. ὥστε οἱ
ἐκ πίστεως εὐλογοῦνται σὺν τῷ πιστῷ Ἀβραάμ.

10 "Οσοι γάρ εἰξ ἔργων νόμου εἰσὶν They who are of the works of the Law lie under a curse, from which Christ has freed us, having ensured to all in Himself the blessing of Abraham.

Mut. Nom. § 29, Vol. I. p. 602 (ed. Mang.); and the eccles. writers. **ὅτι ἐνευλογ.]** ‘shall be blessed in.’ quotation, by means of the usual *ὅτι recitativum*, from Gen. xii. 3 (comp. ch. xviii. 18, xxi. 18), though not in the exact words; the here more apposite but practically synonymous *ώντα τὰ έθνη* being used (perhaps from ch. xviii. 18) instead of the *πᾶσαι αἱ φύλα τῆς γῆς* of the LXX: comp. Surenhus. *Bibl. Cataлл.* p. 567.

The simple form *εὐλογηθεῖ* is adopted by Elz. (not Steph.), but only with FG and cursive mss.

ἐν σοὶ]

‘in thee,’ as the spiritual father of all the faithful; not ‘per te,’ Schott, but simply and plainly ‘in te,’ Vulg., Clarom,—the prep. with its usual force specifying Abraham as the *substratum, foundation*, on which and in which the blessing rests: comp. 1 Cor. vii. 14, and Winer, *Gr.* § 48. a, p. 345.

9. **ὥστε]** ‘So then,’ ‘Consequently,’ see notes on ch. ii. 13. “Πότε states the result from the emphatic *ἐνευλογ.* (*συλλογιζόμενος ἐπήγαγεν* Chrys.): it is from the fact of the blessing having been promised to Abraham and his children that *οἱ ἐκ πιστῶν* share it, inasmuch as they are true children (ver. 7) of Abraham; *εὐλογημένοι εἰσὶν οἱ... τῇ πιστεὶ προσιόντες,* *ώστε καὶ δι πιστὸς Ἀβρ. ηὐλόγητο* Theoph.

σύν] ‘together with;’ not ‘similiter,’ Grot., but, in accordance with the regular meaning of the prep., ‘with,’ ‘in association with’ (Winer, *Gr.* § 48. b, p. 349), the *πιστῷ* serving to hint (Mey., Alf.) at that to which this association is truly to be referred; *εἰ τις τοινῦ τῆς ἐκείνου συγγενεῖς δέκω-*

θῆναι ποθεῖ, τὴν ἐκείνου πιστῶν ἤγλοντω Theod. The change of prep. introduces a corresponding change in the aspect in which Abraham is regarded: under *ἐν* he is regarded as the Patriarch, the spiritual ancestor in *whom*,—under *σύν* he is regarded as the illustriously faithful individual *with whom* all *οἱ ἐκ πιστ.* share the blessing; see Windischm. *in loc.* Schott cites a similar use of *μετά*, with gen., Psalm cv. 6, *ημάρτομεν μετὰ τῶν πατέρων* Eccles. ii. 16, *διωθανεῖται δὲ σοφὸς μετὰ τοῦ ἀφρούρος* but in both cases a similarity of lot, rather than a strict community and fellowship in it, seems implied: as a general rule *μετά τινος* implies rather *coexistence, σύν τινι, coherence*; see Krüger, *Sprachl.* § 68. 13. 1, and comp. notes on *Eph.* vi. 23.

10. **ὅσοι γάρ κ.τ.λ.]** Proof of the justice of the conclusion in ver. 9 with regard to *οἱ ἐκ πιστῶν*: *γάρ* introducing *e contrario* a confirmatory notice of the acknowledged state of the other class, *οἱ εἰς ἔργων νόμου* not only are they not blessed with Abraham, but they are actually under a curse. St Paul’s love of proving all his assertions has been often noticed; compare Davidson, *Introd.* Vol. II. p. 145. *οἱ εἰς ἔργων νόμου* ‘they who are of,’ i. e. appertain to, rest upon, ‘*the works of the law*’ ‘qui in lege justitiam querunt;’ Bull, *Harm. Ap.* II. 7. 12; the primary force of *ἐκ*, owing to the nature of the expression, being here slightly less obvious than in ver. 8, and suggesting more the secondary and derivative idea of *dependence on* than of direct *origination from*; see Winer

ὑπὸ κατάραν εἰσίν· γέγραπται γὰρ ὅτι ἐπικατάρατος πᾶς ὃς οὐκ ἔμμενε ἐν πᾶσιν τοῖς γεγραμένοις ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τοῦ νόμου, τοῦ ποιῆσαι αὐτά.
ὅτι δὲ ἐν νόμῳ οὐδεὶς δικαιοῦται παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ δῆλον, II

in loc., and comp. 1 Cor. xii. 16, οὐκ εἴμι ἐκ τοῦ σώματος. ὑπὸ κατάραν] ‘under a curse;’ not ‘under the curse,’ but almost simply and generally, ‘under curse’ = ἐπικατάρατος, comp. ὁφ’ ἀμαρτίαν, Rom. iii. 9: the proof drawn from the O. T. becomes thus more cogent. ‘Τόδι, it may be remarked, has appy. here no quasi-physical sense (*κατάρα* being viewed in the light of a burden, Rück., Windischm.), but its common ethical sense of *subjection to*; see Winer, Gr. § 49. k, p. 362.

With regard to the argument, it is only necessary to observe that the whole obviously rests on the admission, which it was impossible not to make, that no one of οἱ ἐγγυῶν νόμον can fulfil all the requisitions of the law; see esp. Bull, *Harm. Apost.* II. 7. 11, and compare with it Usteri, *Lehrb.* I. 4. B, p. 60.

γέγραπται γάρ] Confirmation from Scripture of the preceding words. The quotation is from Deut. xxvii. 26, though not in the exact words either of the Heb. or LXX; comp. Surenhus. *Biblos Kataall.*, p. 569, and Bagge in loc. The following δη̄ is omitted by Rec., but only with KL; mss., and some Ff. τοῦ τενήσαι αὐτά] ‘to do them,’ ‘ut faciat ea,’ Vulg., Clarom.; purpose contemplated and involved in the ἔμμενει. This use of the infin. to denote *design, intention*, is (with the exception of a few instances from the other writers in the N.T., Mark iv. 3, James v. 17) confined to St Paul and St Luke: see Fritz. *Math. Excurs.* II. p. 485; Winer, Gr. § 44. 4. b, p. 290. The construction is not, properly con-

sidered, Hebraistic, but belongs to later Greek, and may be correctly explained as an amplification of the use of the gen. which serves first to mark the *result* or *product* (e.g. Il. II. 397, κύματα παντούν ἀνέμων Scheuerl. Synt. § II. 1, p. 79), then further, the *purpose* of the working object, and lastly (e.g. in LXX, where the Hebr. idiom would naturally cause this development) becomes little more than *explanatory* and *definitive*; comp. Gen. iii. 6, ὡραῖον ἔστι τοῦ καταροῦσαι Exod. ii. 18, ἀραχνῶτε τοῦ παραγένεσθαι. In this latter case the first verb commonly marks a more general action, the second, one more limiting and special; comp. Gen. xxxiv. 17, εἰσακούεις ἡμῶν τοῦ περιτεμέσθαι and see esp. Thiersch, *de Pent.* III. 12, p. 173 sq., where this usage is well investigated. The progress of this structure in classical Greek is briefly noticed by Bernhardy, Synt. IX. 2, p. 357.

II. δη̄ δὲ κ.τ.λ.] ‘But (further) that in the law, &c.’ continuation of the reasoning; δὲ subjoining to the *argumentum e contrario* (that those of the law are under the curse, ver. 10) the supplementary argument derived from Scripture that *no one* under any circumstances is justified by the law. The oppositional force of δὲ may thus be felt in the incidental reply which the verse affords to a deduction that might have been obviously made from ver. 10; ‘but—lest any one should imagine that if a man *did* so ἔμμενει κ.τ.λ. he would be blessed—let me add, &c.’ comp. De Wette in loc. ἐν νόμῳ] ‘under the

12 ὅτι ὁ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται· ὁ δὲ νόμος οὐκ
ζῆστιν ἐκ πίστεως, ἀλλ' ὁ ποιήσας αὐτὰ ζήσεται ἐν.

law; i.e. in the sphere and domain of the law; Acts xiii. 39, Rom. ii. 12, iii. 19. The instrumental meaning is grammatically tenable (object existing in the means, Jelf, *Gr.* § 622. 3, see notes on 1 *Thess.* iv. 18), and even contextually plausible, owing to the prominence of *ἐν νόμῳ* and its apparent opposition to *Χριστός*, ver. 13 (see Meyer): as however, owing to the inversion of the syllogism, the opposition between the clauses is much obscured, the simpler and more usual meaning is here to be preferred: comp. notes on 1 *Thess.* ii. 3. The more inclusive *ἐν* is thus perhaps chosen designedly, as the Apostle's object is appy. to show that the idea of justification falls wholly *out of the domain of the law*, and is incompatible with its very nature and character.

ταρά τῷ Θεῷ] ‘in the sight of, i.e. in the judgment of God’ (Rom. ii. 13, xii. 16, 1 Pet. ii. 20); the idea of locality suggested by the prep. being still retained in that of judgment at a tribunal; see notes on 2 *Thess.* i. 6. This usage is sufficiently common in classical writers; see Bernhardy, *Synt.* v. 27. b, p. 257, and exx. in Palm u. Rost, *Lex. s. v. ταρά*, II. 2, Vol. II. p. 667.

ὅτι ὁ δίκαιος κ.τ.λ.] ‘because, The just shall live by faith,’ Habak. ii. 4, again cited in Rom. i. 17, Heb. x. 38,—this second *ὅτι* being causal, the first simply declarative. It is extremely difficult to decide whether *ἐκ πίστης* is to be joined with *ὁ δίκαιος* (‘the just by faith’) or with the verb. The former is perfectly correct in point of grammar, though doubted by Bp Middl. (see Winer, *Gr.* § 20. 2, p. 123), and is adopted by Hammond, Meyer, and other careful expositors.

As however it seems certain (opp. to Baumg.-Crus.) that the original Hebrew (see Hitzig in *loc.*, *Kl. Prophet.* pp. 263, 264) does not bear this meaning,—as St Paul is quoting the words in the order in which they stand in the LXX, not in that (*ὁ ἐκ πίστης δίκαιος*) most favourable to such a transl.,—as the argument seems best sustained by the other construction (see Middl. in *loc.*, and comp. Bull, *Exam. Cens. Animadv. III. 5*),—and lastly, as *ζήσεται ἐκ πίστης* thus stands in more exact opposition to *ζήσεται ἐν αὐτοῖς*, it seems best with Copt., Arm. (appy.), Chrys. (appy.), and the bulk of the older expositors, to connect *ἐκ πίστεως* with *ζήσεται*.

12. ὁ δὲ νόμος κ.τ.λ.] ‘But the law is not of faith,’ scil. does not spring from it, has no connexion with it in point of principle or origin; *propositio minor* of the syllogism, *ὁ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστης ζήσεται* being the *prop. major*, *ἐν νόμῳ οὐδὲ δίκαιούραι* the *conclusion*. The Auth.-Vers. by translating *δὲ* ‘and’ obscures the argument. ὁ ποιήσας αὐτὰ] ‘he who hath done them,’ scil. τὰ προστάγματα and τὰ κρίματα, mentioned in the former part of Lev. xviii. 5, the verse here referred to. Ποιήσας is emphatic (‘praecepta legis non sunt de credendis sed de faciendis;’ Aquin.), and is prefaced by the adversative *δλλα* as expressing a sentiment directly opposite to what has preceded. There is thus no ellipse of *γέγραπται* (Schott) or *λέγεται* (Bagge); comp. Fritz. *Rom. Vol. II. p. 284.* The insertion of *ἀνθρώπος* after *αὐτὰ* (*Rec.*) has only the authority of D³EKL and mss., and is rightly rejected by most modern editors.

τὸν αὐτοὺς] ‘in them,’ i.e. as Winer paraphrases, ‘ut in his legibus vitæ fons quasi insit.’

ἀντοῖς. Χριστὸς ἡμᾶς ἐξηγόρασεν ἐκ τῆς κατάρας 13
τοῦ νόμου γενόμενος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν κατάρα, ὅτι γέγραπται

13. Χριστὸς ἡμᾶς κ.τ.λ.] ‘Christ ransomed us, &c.’ vivid and studiously abrupt contrast to the declaration involved in the two preceding verses; the law condemned us, Christ ransomed us: ‘non dissimile asyndeton Col. iii. 4, ubi item de Christo.’ Beng. [ἡμᾶς] Jews; not Jews and heathens; ‘Judæos prescipue pressit maledictio;’ Beng., comp. Chrys. For (1) the whole context implies that the law is the Mosaic law; see Usteri in loc.: (2) this law had, strictly speaking, no force over the Gentiles, but was in fact the *μεθορύσης* between the Jews and Gentiles (Eph. ii. 14, 15). For a further discussion of this, consult Meyer and Usteri in loc., and Brown, *Galat.* p. 129 sq. The doctrinal deductions made from this and similar passages, though perfectly just and true (comp. Neand. *Plant.* Vol. I. p. 438, Bohu), cannot be urged against the more limited meaning which the context seems obviously to require.

ἐξηγόρασεν] ‘ransomed,’ ‘redeemed.’ Christ ransomed the Jews from the curse of the law, by having taken it upon Himself for their sakes and in their stead. An accurate explanation of this, and the cognate idea *ἀπολύτρωσις*, will be found in Ust. *Lehrb.* II. I. 1, p. 107, and II. I. 3, p. 202. The force of the preposition *ἐκ* need not be very strongly pressed, e.g. ‘emtione nos inde eruit;’ Beng.: see Polyb. *Hist.* III. 42. 2, ἐξηγόρασε παρ' αὐτῶν τὰ τε μονήκλα πλοῦτα κ.τ.λ., where the prep. has no marked meaning. This tendency to use verbs compounded with prepp. without any obvious increase of meaning is one of the characteristics of later Greek: Thiersch, *de Pentat. vers. Alex.* II. 1,

p. 83. γενόμενος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν κατ.] ‘by having become a curse for us;’ dependent participle expressing the manner of the action, which again is more distinctly elucidated in the quotation; λέγει δὲ καὶ τὸν τρόπον’ Theod. The abstract *κατάρα* (not, ‘an accursed thing,’ Peile,—which dilutes the antithesis) is probably chosen, as Meyer suggests, instead of the concrete, to express with more force the completeness of the satisfaction which Christ made to the law. On the doctrinal import of the expression (*κατάρα φάουσε δί* ἐμὲ δ τὴν ἐμὴν λύων *κατάραν*’ Greg. Naz.) see the quotations in Suicer, *Thes.* s. v. *κατάρα*, Vol. II. p. 57 sq., and for a few words of great force and eloquence on the ‘maledictum crucis,’ Andrewes, *Serm.* III. Vol. II. p. 174 (A.-C. Libr.). ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν] ‘for us,’ ‘salutis nostræ reparandæ causæ;’ Schott. In this and similar passages the exact meaning of the prep. has been much contested. Is it (a) *in commodum aliquius*, or (β) *in loco aliquius*? The following seems the most simple answer. ‘Τῷ in its ethical sense has principally and primarily (see note, ch. i. 4) the first meaning, especially in doctrinal passages where the atoning death of Christ is alluded to, e.g. 2 Cor. v. 21, τὸν μὴ γνώντα ἀμαρτίαν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀμαρτίαν ἐτοίχειν. But as there are general passages in the N. T. where ὑπὲρ has eminently the second meaning, e.g. Philem. 13, Ιψὶ ὑπὲρ σοῦ μοι διακονεῖ (comp. Plato, *Gorg.* p. 515 C, Φύω ὑπὲρ σοῦ ἀποκρινούμεναι),—so are there doctrinal passages (as here) where ὑπὲρ may admit the second meaning *united* with the first, when the context (e.g. in 1 Cor. xv. 3 it would be inadmissible) and

14 Ἐπικατάρατος πᾶς ὁ κρεμάμενος ἐπὶ ξύλου, ἵνα εἰς τὰ
ἔθνη ἡ εὐλογία τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ γένηται ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ,
ἵνα τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ Πνεύματος λάβωμεν διὰ τῆς
πίστεως.

nature of the argument seem to require it, though probably never (Winer, *Gr.* § 47. 1, p. 342) the second *exclusively*: see Magee, *Atonement*, No. 30, Vol. I. p. 245 sq., and Usteri, *Lehrb.* III. 1, p. 115 sq., where the meaning of the preposition is briefly discussed. ὅτι γέγραπται] ‘*forasmuch as it is written*;’ parenthetical confirmation of the assertion involved in the preceding participial clause, γενόμενος κ.τ.λ. The passage in Deut. (ch. xxi. 23) here adduced does not allude to crucifying, but to exposure after death on stakes or crosses (Josh. x. 26), yet is fully pertinent as specifying the ‘ignominious particularity to which the legal curse belonged,’ and which our Redeemer by hanging dead on the cross formally fulfilled; see esp. Pearson, *Creed*, Art. IV. Vol. I. p. 248 sq. (Burt.). It is interesting to notice that the dead body was not hanged by the neck, but *by the hands*, and not on a tree, but on a piece of wood, (‘*non ex arbore sed ligno*,’ Dassov.): see the treatise of Dassovius in *Thesaur. Theolog.-Philol.* Vol. II. p. 614; Jahn, *Archaeol.* § 258; and Bähr, *Stud. u. Krit.* for 1849, p. 924 sq. The reading of Rec., γέγραπται γάρ, has the support of D²E²KLN; most mss.; Syr. (both), Copt., al., but bears every appearance of a conformation to the more usual mode of citation, ver. 10.

14. ἵνα εἰς τὰ οἴνη] ‘*In order that unto the Gentiles*:’ divine purpose involved in the ἐξηγγόρασεν ἐκ τῆς κατάρ-
ρας κ.τ.λ. The first purpose was the ransom of the *Jews* from the curse; the second, which was involved in the

first (ὅτι ἡ σωτηρία ἐκ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἔστη· John iv. 22), was the extension of Abraham’s blessing to the *Gentiles*, but that, not through the law, but in Jesus Christ. *Eis* with accus. is here neither simply identical with dat. (comp. Winer, *Gr.* § 31. 5, p. 191), nor in its more lax sense of ‘in reference to’ (Peile; comp. Bernh. *Synt.* v. 11, p. 219), but retains its proper *local* meaning, with ref. to the metaphorical arrival of the *εὐλογία*: see Winer, *Gr.* § 49. a, p. 353.

ἡ εὐλογία τοῦ Ἀβρ.] ‘*the blessing of Abraham*,’ scil. the blessing announced to and vouchsafed to Abraham (ver. 8), ἡ εὐλογία ἡ ἐκ πλοτερῶν: Theoph.; the gen. being the *gen. objecti*; comp. Rom. xv. 8, τὰς ἐπαγγελίας τῶν πατέρων and see Winer, *Gr.* § 30. 1, p. 167 sq.; Krüger, *Sprachl.* § 47. 7. 1 sq.

ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησ.] ‘*in Christ Jesus*,’ ‘*in Christo Jesu*,’ Vulg., Clarom., Copt., Arm.; not ‘propter,’ *Æth.*, or for *διά*, Grot. (comp. Chrys.), as this instrumental use of *ἐν* with persons, though found in a few passages (comp. Matth. ix. 34. ἐν τῷ δρυχοῦτι, —he was the *causa efficiens*), is here certainly not necessary. It was ‘*in Christ*,’ in the knowledge of Him and in His death, that the *Gentiles* received the blessing.

ἵνα τὴν κ.τ.λ.] ‘*in order that we might receive*:’ second statement of purpose, not subordinated to, but co-ordinate with the preceding one. Meyer cites as instances of a similar parallelism with *ἵνα*, Rom. vii. 13, 2 Cor. ix. 3, Eph. vi. 19, 20. The Apostle advances with his subject, till

Even the customs of men must show that the promise of God ὅμως ἀνθρώπου κεκυρωμένην διαθήκην to Abraham cannot be annulled by the law which came so long afterwards.

at last under λάθωμεν he includes all; ‘nos, omnium gentium homines, sive Judæi, sive Barbari.’

τὴν ἐπαγγέλλαν τοῦ Πνεύματος] ‘the promise of the Spirit.’ not merely τὸ ἐπαγγελθὲν Πνεῦμα (Fritz. Rom. vi. 4, Vol. I. p. 368), but ‘the realization of the promise of the Spirit,’ ἐπαγγ. being taken in a partially concrete sense; comp. Luke xxiv. 49, Heb. x. 36, and see Winer, Gr. § 34. 3. p. 211. Grammatically considered, τοῦ Πνεύματος may be a gen. subjecti, sc. ‘promissionem a Spiritu profectam,’ or a gen. objecti, as above. Doctrinally considered however, the latter is distinctly to be preferred; the Spirit being usually represented by the Apostle as not so much the source, as the pledge of the fulfilment of the promise, see Usteri, Lehrb. II. I. 2, p. 174, note. After a wondrous chain of arguments, expressed with equal force, brevity, and profundity, the Apostle comes back to the subject of ver. 2; the gift of the Holy Ghost came through faith in Jesus Christ.

15. ἔδελφοι κ.τ.λ.] Proof that the promise was not abrogated by the law: οὐτω δεῖξας τὴν πιστιν πρεσβύτεραν τοῦ νόμου, διδόσκει πᾶλιν ως δὲ σώμας ἐμποδὼν οὐ δύναται γενέσθαι ταῦς Θεοῦ ἐπαγγελτας. Theod.

κατὰ ἀνθρώπουν] ‘after the manner of men,’ ἐξ ἀνθρωπίνων παραδειγμάτων. Chrys.; ἀνθρωπίνων πρόγυμασι κέχρημα: Theod.; see notes, ch. i. II. With this expression the Apostle here introduces an argument which rests on mere human analogies, and which he uses as men might (‘tamquam inter homines,’ Syr.) one to another: ‘affero exemplum ex hominum virtute depromptum;’ Fritz. Rom.

iii. 5, Vol. I. p. 160, where the various meanings of this formula will be found briefly noticed.

ὅμως δυθράπον κ.τ.λ.] ‘though it be but a man’s covenant, yet when confirmed, &c.’ logically inexact but not idiomatically uncommon transposition of δῶμα, which, as the sense shows, really belongs to οὐδεῖς. Both δῶμα and other adverbs (e.g. δε, πολλάκις, ἔτι) are occasionally thus as it were attracted out of their logical order, when the meaning is otherwise distinct; see Winer, Gr. § 61. 4, p. 488, and Ellendt, Lex. Soph. s.v. δῶμα, who observes that this transposition is most frequently found with participles; ‘δῶμα cum participio ita componitur, ut inclusum protaci tamen ad apodosin pertineat;’ Vol. II. p. 318: comp. Plato, Phædo, p. 91 C, φοβεῖται μὴ ή ψυχὴ δῶμα καὶ θειότερον καὶ καλλιότερον δὲ τοῦ σώματος προστολόντας: and see Stallbaum in loc. διαθήκην] ‘a covenant.’ It may be true, doctrinally considered, that it is not of much moment whether διαθ. be interpreted ‘contractum, an testamentum’ (Calv.); considered however exegetically, it is obvious that (a) the order of the words, and (b) the comparison between the διαθήκη of man and the διαθήκη of God (ver. 17), tacitly instituted by the emphatic position of δυθράπον (sing. to make the antithesis more apparent), both require exclusively the former meaning; so ΖΕΘ. (*kidan*), and appy. Theoph. διαθήκην καὶ συμφωνίαν the other Vv. either adopt διαθήκη (Syr., Copt.), or are ambiguous. A paper on the uses of this word in the N. T. will be found in the *Classical Museum*, Vol. VII. p. 299; see also Bagge in loc.

16 οὐδεὶς ἀθετεῖ ἡ ἐπιδιατάσσεται. τῷ δὲ Ἀβραὰμ ἔρρε-
θησαν αἱ ἐπαγγελίαι, καὶ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ. οὐ
λέγει Καὶ τοῖς σπέρμασιν, ὡς ἐπὶ πολλῶν, ἀλλ' ὡς
ἐφ' ἑνός Καὶ τῷ σπέρματι σου, ὃς ἐστιν Χριστός.

ἐπιδιατάσσεται] ‘adds new conditions,’ ‘superordinat,’ Vulg., Clarom., ‘novas addit constitutiones,’ Bretsch. *Lexx.* s.v. or, in effect, as it is neatly paraphrased by Herm., ‘additamentis vitiatis;’ compare Joseph. *Aniq.* xvii. 9. 4, and esp. *Bell. Jud.* II. 2. 3, ἀξῶν τῆς ἐπιδιαθήκης τὴν διαθήκην εἶναι κυριωτέραν.

16. τῷ δὲ Ἀβραὰμ] ‘Now to Abraham:’ parenthetical argument designed to make the application of this particular example to the general case perfectly distinct, and to obviate every misapprehension. The Apostle seems to say; ‘this however is not a case merely of a διαθήκη, but of an ἐπαγγελία,—yea, of ἐπαγγελίαι:’ nor was it made merely to a man Abraham (ἀνθρ. διαθ.), but to Christ.’ According to the usual interpretation, δὲ introduces the *prop. minor* of a syllogism, which is interrupted by the parenthetical comment οὐ λέγει . . . Χριστός, but resumed in ver. 17, ‘atqui Abraamo et semini, &c.’ Herm. To this however the objection of Meyer seems very just, that in that case St Paul would have undoubtedly given a greater logical prominence to the *divine* nature of the promises to Abraham by some such turn as Θεὸς δὲ τῷ Ἀβρ. κ.τ.λ. see also Alf. *in loc.*

αἱ ἐπαγγελίαι] ‘the promises,’ plural, as being several times repeated (Est.), and couched in different forms of expression; comp. Gen. xiii. 15, xv. 18, xvii. 8, xxvi. 4, xxviii. 14. They involved, as Bengel well observes, not only earthly but heavenly blessings, ‘terram Canaan et mundi, et divinorum bonorum om-

nium.’ The latter were more distinctly future, the former paulo-post-future. On the exact spiritual nature of these promises, see Hengstenberg, *Christol.* Vol. I. p. 38 (Clark).

The so called Ionic form ἔρρεθησαν has the support of the best uncial MSS. and is adopted by most of the recent editors; see Lobeck. *Phryn.* p. 447. καὶ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ] ‘and to his seed;’ emphatic, as pointing to Christ, and forming as it were the fulcrum of the argument which follows. The passages of scripture referred to are here appy. Gen. xiii. 15, and xvii. 8, but not Gen. xxii. 18: so Iren. v. 32; Origen *on Rom.* iv. Vol. v. p. 276 (ed. Lomm.).

We may here pause to make a brief remark on the great freedom with which so many commentators have allowed themselves to characterize St Paul’s argument as either artificial (*Schulkunst*, Ewald) or Rabbinical (Mey.; comp. Surenhus. *Βίβλος Καταλλ.* p. 84), or, as Baur, *Apost. Paul.* p. 665, has even ventured to assert, ‘plainly arbitrary and incorrect.’ It may be true that similar arguments occur in Rabbinical writers (Schoettg. *Hor. Hebr.* Vol. I. p. 736); it may be true that σπέρμα (like γῆ) is a collective noun, and that when the plural is used, as in Dan. i. 12, ‘grains of seed’ are implied. All this may be so,—nevertheless we have here an interpretation which the Apostle, writing under the illumination of the Holy Ghost, has deliberately propounded, and which therefore (whatever difficulties may at first sight appear in it) is profoundly and indisputably true.

τοῦτο δέ λέγω διαθήκην προκεκυρωμένην ὑπὸ τοῦ ι⁷
Θεοῦ [εἰς Χριστὸν] ὡς μετὰ τετρακόσια καὶ τριά-

17. *εἰς Χριστόν* ‘for Christ,’ i.e., to be fulfilled in Christ: not ‘usque ad tempora Christi,’ or ‘in reference to Christ’ (Peile), but as in ver. 24. These words are omitted by ABCN; 17. 23^o.67^o.80; Vulg., Copt., Æth. (both); Cyr. (2), Dam.; Jerome, Aug. (often), Pel., Bod. (*Lachm., Tisch., Mey.*),—and it must be fairly owned have *some* appearance of being a gloss: still the authority for the insertion, viz. DEFGK; most mass.; Syr. (both), Clarom., Arm. [correct *Griesb.*]; Chrys., Theod., Theoph., *Œcum.* (*Rec., Scholz.*), is perhaps sufficiently strong to warrant an insertion in brackets. See Bagge in loc. (p. 95), who has argued with ability in favour of the Received Text.

We hold therefore that there is as certainly a mystical meaning in the use of *Υἱοῦ* in Gen. xiii. 15, xvii. 8, as there is an argument for the resurrection in Exod. iii. 6, though in neither case was the writer necessarily aware of it. As *Υἱοῦ* in its simple meaning generally (except Gen. iv. 25, 1 Sam. i. 11) denotes not the mere progeny of a man, but his posterity viewed as one organically-connected whole; so here in its mystical meaning it denotes not merely the spiritual posterity of Abraham, but Him in whom that posterity is all organically united, the *πλήρωμα*, the *κεφαλή*, even Christ. This St Paul endeavours faintly to convey to his Greek readers by the use of *στέρμα* and *στέρματα*: see Oish. and Windischm. in loc., both of whom may be consulted with profit.
εὐ λέγει] ‘He saith not,’ not *ἡ γραφή* (Bos. *Ellips.* p. 54), as in Rom. xv. 10, —where this subst. is supplied from *γέγραπται*, ver. 9,—or *τὸ Πνεῦμα* (Rück.), which appears arbitrary, but the natural subject *ὁ Θεός*, as in Eph. iv. 8, v. 14, and (*φησι*) 1 Cor. vi. 16, Heb. viii. 5: see Winer, *Gr.* § 58. 9, p. 463. So appy. Syr., which here inserts *Οὐ* [illi] after *λέγει*. *εἰς ἐπὶ* *πολλῶν*] ‘as (speaking) of many.’ Apparently a solitary instance in the

N. T. of this meaning of *ἐπὶ* with *γέν.* after verbs ‘dicendi,’ &c. (2 Cor. vii. 14 [Rück.]) is not in point, as *ἐπὶ Τίτον* is there ‘coram Tito’) though not uncommon in classical Greek; comp. Plato, *Charm.* p. 155 D, *ἐπὶ τῷ καλοῦ λέγων ταῦθεν*; and ib. *Gorg.* p. 453 E, *πάλιν δὲ εἰ ἐπὶ τῷ αὐτῷ τεχνῶν λέγομεν*. In this use of *ἐπὶ* a trace of the local meaning (*super-position*, Donalds. *Gr.* § 483) may be distinctly perceived, the gen. representing as it were the *substratum* on which the action rests; comp. John vi. 2; and see Bernhardy, *Synt.* v. 23, p. 248; Winer, *Gr.* § 47. g, p. 335; and for a comprehensive notice of this prep., Wittmann, *de Naturâ, &c.* *ἐπὶ* (Schweinf. 1846). *εἰς ἀρτιν* *Χριστός*] ‘Christ (Jesus),’ not Christ and his Church, as Hammond in loc.: this appears evident from the emphasis which St Paul lays on the use of the singular; *στέρμα δὲ αὐτοῦ κατὰ σάρκα ἔστιν ὁ Χριστός*: Chrys. Some useful remarks on this passage will be found in the *Theol. Critic.* No. IV. p. 494 sq.

17. *τοῦτο εὐ λέγω*] ‘This however I say,’ ‘hoc autem dico,’ Vulg., Clarom. Instead of using the collective *οὐ*, which might obscure the exact position which ver. 16 holds in the argument, St Paul uses the explana-

κοντα ἔτη γεγονώς νόμος οὐκ ἀκυροῖ, εἰς τὸ καταρ-
18 γῆσαι τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν. εἰ γὰρ ἐκ νόμου ἡ κληρονομία,

tory formula τοῦτο δὲ λέγω. The δὲ thus serves both to resume the argument (*σαφηνεῖς χάρις ἀναλαμβάνει τὸν λόγον* (Ecum.)) after the short digression καὶ ἀνθρ. λέγω—τοῦτο δὲ λέγω, and also to mark the application of the particular case to the general principle.

δ μερὶς τετρακόσια κ.τ.λ.] ‘which came (so long a time as) four hundred and thirty years afterwards;’ μερὶς πλείστων χρόνον. Theodoret. The chronological difficulty involved in this passage when compared with Gen. xv. 13, Exod. xii. 40, and Acts vii. 6, can only be briefly noticed. Here the period from the promise to the exodus is stated to be 430 years; but in Exod. l. c. the same period, and in Gen. and Acts l. c. the round number 400, is assigned to the sojourn in Egypt alone. The ancient mode of explanation seems perfectly satisfactory,—viz. that the 430 years include the sojourn in Canaan (about 215 years) as well as that in Egypt; the whole period of abode ἐν γῇ οὐδὲ λόγῳ, Gen. xv. 13; comp. August. *Quæst. in Heptat.* II. 47 (Vol. III. p. 611, Migne); Usher, *Chronol. Sacr.* ch. 8. This is confirmed by the addition of the words καὶ ἐν γῇ Χανάν (Exod. l. c.) in the LXX and Samar. Pent.: see Petav. *Rat. Temp.* II. Book 2. 4, Vol. II. p. 71; Hales, *Chron.* Vol. II. p. 153 (ed. 1811). It may be observed that the records of the family of Levi appear to render so long a sojourn in Egypt as 430 years impossible. Amram, grandson of Levi, marries his father’s sister Jochebed (Exod. vi. 20; comp. Exod. ii. 1, Numb. xxvi. 59). Now as it appears probable by a comparison of dates that Levi was born when Jacob was about 87, Levi would

have been 43 when he came into Egypt; there he lives 94 years (Exod. vi. 16). Assuming then even that Jochebed was born in the last year of Levi’s life, she must at least have been 256 years old when Moses was born, if the sojourn in Egypt be 430 years: see Windischm. *in loc.*

The transposition ἔτη τετρακ. κ.τ.λ. (Rec.) has against it the authority of all the uncial MSS. except KL, and is certainly to be rejected.

εἰς τὸ καταργήσαν κ.τ.λ.] ‘that it should render the promise of none effect,’ ad evanquandam promissionem,’ Vulg., Clarom. (comp. *Aeth.*, *Syr.-Philox.*); εἰς τὸ with the infinitive here retaining its usual primary force of *object* or *intention*: τὸ καταργ. was the object aimed at by the invalidation. It may be remarked that as the prep. alone may point to *consequence* as well as *intention* (see exx. in Rost u. Palm, *Lex.* s. v. ἐπί, v. 1), we must not abruptly deny what is termed the *ebatic* force of εἰς τὸ still usage seems to show that in St Paul’s Epp. the final εἰς τὸ so much predominates (opp. to Jelf, *Gr.* § 625. 3. a), that even in passages like 2 Cor. viii. 6, we must not conceive all idea of *purpose* wholly obliterated; comp. Winer, *Gr.* § 44. 6, p. 294 sq., and see notes on *1 Thess.* ii. 12.

18. εἰ γὰρ ἐκ νόμου] Confirmatory expansion of the preceding words; ‘I say advisedly εἰς τὸ καταργ. κ.τ.λ. for if the inheritance be of the law, the promise must plainly be reduced to inoperativeness and invalidity;’ see Theoph. *in loc.* The prep. ἐκ here preserves its primary meaning of *origin* under the slight modification of *result* or *consequence*; see notes on ch. ii. 16. ή κληρονομίᾳ ‘the

οὐκέτι ἐξ ἐπαγγελίας τῷ δὲ Ἀβραὰμ δι' ἐπαγγελίας κεχάρισται ὁ Θεός.

The law was (*positive answer*) to bring the conviction of sin; and was not (*negative answer*) against the promises of God, to which it was a preparative institution.

inheritance; here used by the Apostle in its higher meaning to denote that inheritance of the blessings of the Messiah's kingdom, the inheritance of the heavenly Canaan, which was typified by the lower and primary meaning, the inheritance of the earthly Canaan; comp. Acts vii. 5, Heb. xi. 8, and see Brown, p. 147.

οὐκέτι δὲ ἐπαγγελίας] 'it is no more of promise;' the latter supposition is excluded by the former; comp. Rom. vii. 20, xi. 6, and see Winer, *Gr.* § 65. 10, p. 545. Οὐκέτι is thus used in its simple *logical* sense without any temporal reference.

δι' ἐπαγγελίας] 'by means of promise;' not 'in the form of a promise' (Peile, Rück.), nor as uniting with κεχρ. as a mere equivalent to ἐπαγγελτο (Aeth., both); but simply and plainly 'per promissionem,' Beza, 'by virtue and by means of promise.' The enjoyment of the inheritance depended on no conditions, came through no other medium, save that of promise.

κεχάρισται] 'hath freely given it,' 'gratis dedit,' Copt.; 'notanda est emphasis in voce κεχ.' quae a χάρις deducitur, adeoque a Beza (!) recte vertitur *gratificatus est*, confer Rom. iv. 13, 14, 15; Bull, *Harm. Ap.* II. 5. 5. *Kechr.* may be translated intransitively, 'Abrahamo grata fecit Deus' (Schott, Olah., Bretsch.); but as the verb is nearly always used transitively in the N. T., and as logical perspicuity requires that the subject of the first member of the conditional syllogism (Beng.) should be supplied in the second, it appears most natural to supply tacitly κληρονομᾶς as the

Tί οὖν ὁ νόμος; τῶν παραβάσεων 19

obvious object-accusative. With the present use of the perf., implying the *duration* of the χάρις, contrast Phil. ii. 9, ἔχαριστο αὐτῷ δρόμα, where the action is represented as a simple historical fact.

19. τί οὖν ὁ νόμος] 'What then is the law?' i.e., 'what is the meaning, the object of the law?' Answer to the not unnatural objection that the Law must according to the Apostle's reasoning be deemed a useless institution (περιττῶς ἐρέθη; Theod.), by a statement of its real use, office, characteristics, and relation to the covenant of grace: Ιδια μή τις νομίσῃ περιττῶς τὸν νόμον, καὶ τοῦτο διορθώνται τὸ μέρος, δεικνύει οὐδὲ εἰκῇ, ἀλλὰ τὰν χρησίμως ἔδειν. Chrys. This is not for διὰ τί (Schott, Brown), but is the idiomatic neuter expressive of the abstract nature, &c. of the subject; see Bernhardy, *Synt.* VII. 4, p. 336, and comp. Madvig, *Synt.* § 97, note. Meyer cites 1 Cor. iii. 5, τί οὖν ἔστιν Ἀπολλώς, but the MSS. evidence [CDEFGL opp. to ABN] seems there fairly in favour of τίς.

τῶν παραβάσεων χάριν] 'on account of,' 'because of, the transgressions,' 'propter transgressiones,' Vulg.,

Ἄπολλος Κλέος [propter transgressionem] Syr., Copt. (etibbe), and appy. Arm. (vasm); scil. to manifest, awaken a conviction of, and give as it were a distinctive existence to, the transgressions of it (which existed but were not properly recognized as such), whether previous or subsequent to its introduction; comp. Rom. v. 13, χάρις γὰρ νόμου ἀμαρτία ἦν τὸ κεῖμα

χάριν πρόσετέθη; ἄχρις οὐ ἔλθη τὸ σπέρμα φέρηγος

the more generic *ἀμαρτία* being there used, as sin is not contemplated (as here) specially in the light of a transgression of a fixed ordinance. Owing to the various shades of meaning that have been assigned to *χάρων*, the exact significance of these words is somewhat debateable. Of the many interpretations that have been proposed three deserve consideration, (a) ‘*ad coercendas transgressiones;*’ as Chrys. (*διηριχαλισθεὶς θύμοις*), Theoph., Euseb., Jerome, and most of the older expositors; (β) ‘*transgressionum gratia;*’ scil. to call them forth, to multiply them, and as it were bring them to a head, Rom. v. 20, vii. 7; so appy. Clarom., ‘*factorum (!) gratiā;*’ very distinctly Aeth. (both), ‘*ut multiplicarent peccata;*’ and some modern expositors, Meyer, Alf., al.: (γ) ‘*transgressionum causa;*’ i.e. ‘*ut transgressiones palam faceret, eoque modo homines cogerent ad agnitionem sui reatus;*’ Calv.; Rom. iii. 20; so appy. Vulg., Syr., Copt., Arm., Aug., Beza, Winer (appy.), and also in part Hofmann (*Schriftb.* Vol. II. 2, p. 48) who objects both to (a) and the extreme view of (β). Of these interpretations we must, in spite of the authority of the Greek commentators, plainly reject (a) on lexical grounds, as no satisfactory exx. (Soph. *Ed. Col.* 443 [see Herm.]) is not to the point, nor 1 John iii. 12, nor even Clem. *Hom.* XI. 16, *τῶν παρατρωμάτων χάρων ἡ τιμωρία ἐπεταῖ*) have as yet been adduced of such a practically reversed meaning of *χάρων*. The second (β) is more plausible, but still open to the grave objection, that in a comparatively undogmatical passage it ascribes a purpose directly to God (contrast Rom. v. 20, *νόμος παρεσήλθει ἵνα κ.τ.λ.*) which would have certainly needed a fuller explanation.

We may retain therefore with some confidence (γ), which is both lexically defensible (see below), and yields a good and pertinent sense. The office of the law was to make transgressions palpable, to awaken a conviction of sin in the heart (*τὸ πεῖσμα εἰδέναι τὰ οἰκεῖα ἀμαρτήματα* Chrys.), and make man feel his need of a Saviour. It was thus also necessarily temporary (*διχρός οὐ κ.τ.λ.*); for when the Seed did come, higher influences began to work within. It only remains briefly to answer the lexical objection of Meyer, by stating that *χάρων* (esp. in later writers) does not always mean *in gratiam*, but includes all shades of meaning from *in gratiam* to ‘caused and proper,’ just as those of *ἐφεκτά* range from *caused* to *quod attinet ad*; see Bernh. *Synt.* v. 16, p. 233; Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* s. v. *χάρων*; and comp. exx. in Ast, *Lex. Plat.* and Rost u. Palm, *Lex. a. v.*

A discussion of this passage and the general scope of the law will be found in Petav. *de Preced. I.* 25. 1, Vol. I. p. 461; compare also Bull, *Exam. Cens.* xix. 6, and more recently Baur, *Apost. Paul.* III. 5, p. 581 sq., but observe that all these writers adopt the negative meaning of *χάρων*.

προστέθη] ‘*was superadded,*’ ‘*superaddita est,*’ Herm.; it was however, as Meyer observes, no *ἐνιδιαθήκη*, but a totally fresh institution. The reason is given by Euseb., *ἴνα δεῖξῃ τὸν νόμον μὴ δύτη πμωτότυπον ὥσπερ αἱ ἐπαγγελίαι εἰσι.*

The present reading is supported by ABCD²D³EKL^N; most mss.; Theod. (2), Dam., Theoph., Euseb., and is distinctly to be preferred to *ἔτέθη* (*Rec.*), which has both less external authority [D¹FG; 5 mss. (Vulg., Clarom., appy.,—but in such cases Vv. can hardly be cited)] Clem.,

γελταὶ, διαταγεῖς δὶ' ἀγγέλων, ἐν χειρὶ μεσίτου. ὁ δὲ 20

Orig., Euseb.], and also seems to have been a very natural substitution for a more difficult word. *ἕχος οὐ* *ὤθη* [‘until the seed shall have come.’ ‘terminus ad quem’ of the duration of the newly introduced institution (Mey.) involving the obvious query, *τι περιέρω καὶ παρὰ καιρὸν αὐτῶν ἔλκει;* Chrys. This use of the subjunct. after an aor. in temporal sentences can be fully defended, on the recognized principle that the past is contemplated by the writer as a present, from which as it were he is taking his survey of what would be then future, though now past; see exx. in Winer, *Gr.* § 41. 1, p. 257 sq.; comp. Schmalf. *Synt.* § 128. 2; Klotz, *Devar.* Vol. II. p. 618. It must however be applied with caution both in the N. T. and in later Greek, owing to the gradual disuse of the opt. and the tendency of the subj. to take its place. Meyer calls attention to the omission of *δι* as evincing the idea in St Paul’s mind of all absence of obstacles; see Herm. *de Partic.* *δι*, II. 9, p. 110; Klotz, *Devar.* Vol. II. p. 568; Schmalf. *Synt.* § 121. *φὶ τῷγελται*] ‘to whom the promise has been made;’ *νεπὶ Χριστῷ λέγων* Chrys.; comp. ver. 16, *ἐφέθησα—τῷ στέρματι.* It does not seem desirable to destroy the parallelism of these two clauses by translating *ἔτηγγ.* (sc. δ Θεὸς) actively. *διαταγέων*] ‘ordained;’ not ‘promulgated,’ Ust., Winer; but simply ‘ordinata,’ Vulg., Copt., ‘disposita,’ Clarom.; see Philo, *Op. Mund.* I. 1, *διαταγμένων ὑπὸ τῶν νομοθετῶν* and comp. Hesiod, *Op.* 274, *ὑόμον διέταξε Κρατών,* where one Scholiast (Proclus) paraphrases it by the simple verb. The participial clause serves to add accessory details and distinctions to *νεστερ.*, and is not

prior to, but contemporaneous with the action described by the finite verb; comp. Col. ii. 15, and see notes in loc. On the union of the part. with the finite verb, see the brief but pertinent remarks of Bernhardy, *Synt.* X. 9, p. 383, and the more elaborate notice of Schmalfeld, *Synt.* § 205 sq. It would certainly seem that, esp. in later Greek writers, the part. is often associated with the finite verb, where two verbs united with a copula would have seemed more natural and even more intelligible; see the exx. in Herm. Viger, No. 224. On the best mode of translating this sort of participles, see notes on *Phil.* ii. 30 (*Transl.*). *δι* *ἄγγελῶν*] ‘through angels,’ ‘per angelos,’ Vulg., Clarom., *لَمَّا* [in manu angelorum] Syr., scil. *ἀγγέλων ὑπουργούντων* Theod.: third characteristic of the law (see next note) serving to show the *distinction*, in point of manner and circumstance, between its enactment and the giving of the Promise; ‘per angelos, in manu mediatoris, dupliciter mediate;’ Beng.; comp. Baur, *Paulus*, p. 582. There is thus no reason whatever for modifying this meaning of *δι*: it points simply and plainly to the media and intervening actors, by whose ministry the law was enacted; see Joseph. *Antiq.* XV. 5. 3, *ἡμῶν τὰ κάλλιστα τῶν δογμάτων καὶ τὰ δοιάτα τῶν δι τοῦ νόμου δὶ’ ἀγγέλων παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ μαθητῶν* Deut. xxxiii. 2, LXX; and see Winer, *Gr.* § 47. i, p. 339, note. *ἐν χειρὶ μεσίτου*] ‘in the hand of a mediator,’ ‘in manu mediatoris,’ Syr., Vulg., Clarom., Copt., Arm.: fourth and most important distinction (see below) between the law and the Promise, and to which the argument of ver. 20 spe-

21 μεσίτης ἐνὸς οὐκ ἔστιν, ὁ δὲ Θεὸς εἰς ἔστιν. ὁ οὐν

cially refers. The *ερ* is not instrumental ‘*by the hand*,’ Mey. (on the ground that Moses received the law from God, and gave it to the people; comp. Baur, *Apost. Paul.* p. 583), but, as the use of the singular, and the Aramaic idiom both suggest, combines with *χειρ* as = γένος, scil. ‘*ministerio (mediatoris)*;’ τῇ τούτῳ θέσει Μωυσῆς διάκονοῦτος’ Theodoret; see 2 Chron. xxxiii. 8, Josh. xiv. 2, Wisdom xi. 1. That Moses is the mediator here referred to (Deut. v. 5) seems now so generally admitted, that we may reasonably wonder how the early expositors (Basil and Theodoret are exceptions) could have so generally coincided in the perplexing view of Origen (Vol. v. p. 273, ed. Lomm.) that the *μεσίτης* here mentioned was Christ.

Great difference of opinion however exists as to St Paul’s object in recounting these details. If it was to prove the *lowliness* of the law, such a recital would in several parts rather seem to convey the contrary. If it was to show the *glorious nature* (Mey.), such an object would appear seriously at variance with the context. The more natural view is, that it was to mark the fundamental *differences* between the law and the Gospel, and *thence*, as a natural result of the contrast, the *transitory* and *provisional* nature of the former. The law was an institution, (1) τῷ παραβολεών χέρι, restricted and conditioned; (2) ἀχρός οὐ κ.τ.λ., temporary and provisional; (3) διαργεῖς δι’ ἀγγέλων mediately, not immediately, given by God; (4) εἰς χειρὶ μεσ., mediately, but not immediately, received from God: see Olsh. and Windischm. *in loc.*

20. δὲ μεσίτης] ‘Now every mediator,’ or, according to our English

idiom, ‘a mediator;’ the δὲ being *transitional* (*μεταβατικόν*, see notes on ch. iii. 8), and the article referring, not to the mediator previously mentioned, ‘this mediator’ (Brown), but to the *generic* idea of a mediator: ‘artculus definit indefinita, idque duobus modis, aut designando certo de multis, aut quae multa sunt cunctis in unum colligendis’ Herm. *Iph. Aul.* p. xv. (Pref.); see Winer, *Gr.* § 18. I, p. 97. οὐνος οὐκ οὐτῶν] ‘appertains not unto one,’ ‘does not belong to any single one,—any one who stands isolated and by himself, but implies *two parties*;’ so Copt. and Arm., both of which throw that slight emphasis on the ερδες which the Greek seems both to require and suggest: contrast Hofmann, *Schriftb.* Vol. II. 2, p. 48, who, appy. without any just ground, asserts the contrary. This idea of *singleness* and isolation is really our only clue. With regard to this and the remaining words it is necessary to premise that all idea of the verse being a gloss (Michaelis; Lücke, *Stud. u. Krit.* for 1828, p. 83 sq.) must be summarily dismissed, as there is no variation found in the MSS. or mss. either in the words or their order.

δὲ Θεὸς εἰς οὐτῶν] ‘but God is one;’ ‘God (not without slight emphasis, comp. ver. 21), the direct and personal giver of the Promise, does stand single and isolated,—dealt singly with Abraham (τῷ δὲ Λαβρῷ δι’ ἑπαγγελίας κεχάρισται δὲ Θεός, ver. 18),—and by consequence is (in the promise) *mediatorless*:’ prop. minor of a syllogism, of which the conclusion, being obvious, is omitted; see below. Out of the mass of interpretations of this terse sentence (said positively to exceed 400) those of Schleiermacher, Winer, and Meyer

νόμος κατὰ τῶν ἐπαγγελιῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ; μὴ γένοιτο. εἰ

best deserve attention. A brief notice of these will serve to illustrate the precise nature of the difficulties. In the first part of the verse all are agreed; ‘now every mediator involves the idea of more than one’; in the concluding clause they thus differ: (1) Schleierm., adopted by Usteri, *Lehrb.* II. I. 2, p. 179; ‘but God is one’—in reference to His promises, free, unfettered by conditions. (2) Winer; ‘but God is one’—one part only (comp. *Æth.-Pol.*, ‘*unus est duorum*’); the people of Israel must be the other part: hence they are bound to the law. (3) Meyer; ‘but God (on the contrary) is one,’ and one only (*ein Einziger*); there is then a fundamental difference in the number of parties concerned in the law and the promise. Schl. and Win. thus connect ver. 20 with ver. 19 as an epexegeis; Mey. joins it with ver. 21, making it St Paul’s own statement of a difficulty that might arise in a reader’s mind. Meyer’s interpretation has this advantage over Schleiermacher’s, that it preserves the numerical idea which plainly belongs to *εἰς* and this over Winer’s, that δὲ Θεὸς, which is clearly the subject, is not practically turned into the predicate. In the undue stress however which it places on the idea of unity as opposed to that of plurality, and more esp. in the assumption that δὲ Θεὸς κ.τ.λ. is in fact a monotheistic ‘locus communis’ (comp. Jowett), it cannot be pronounced wholly satisfactory. Perhaps the following simple explanation is less open to objections. The context states briefly the four distinctive features of the law (see above) with tacit reference to the ἐπαγγελία. Three of these are passed over; the

last, as the most important, is noticed; ‘the law was with, the promise was without a mediator.’ Verse 20 thus appears a syllogism of which the conclusion is omitted: ‘Now a mediator does not appertain to one, standing or acting alone; but, in the promise, God is one, does stand and act alone: THEREFORE, in the promise, A MEDIATOR DOES NOT APPERTAIN TO GOD. Is then the law, a dispensation which, besides other distinctions, involved a mediator, opposed to the promises which rested ON GOD, and involved no mediator? God forbid.’ According to this view the only real difficulty is narrowed to the propositio minor. How was God one? And the answer seems,—not because He is essentially unity (comp. De W.); nor because He is one by Himself, and Abraham is one by himself (Baur, *Paul.* p. 583); nor yet because He is both the giver, the Father, and the receiver, the Son, united (ed. I., Windischm.); an interpr. too devoid of simplicity and too expressly theological; but, with the aspect that the last clause of verse 18 puts on the whole reasoning,—because He dealt with Abraham singly and directly, stood alone, and used no mediator. The almost obvious objection to this explanation is, that it implies and involves a limitation (‘in the promise’) in a clause which seems a mere ‘locus communis;’ but the answer does not seem unreasonable, that even assuming that the minor was really suggested to the Apostle as being a general axiomatic statement, his previous declaration of God’s having dealt with Abraham with no other medium than His own gracious promise (δι’ ἐπαγγελίας) showed what he really regarded as the present

γὰρ ἐδόθη νόμος ὁ δυνάμενος ζωοποιῆσαι, ὅντως ἐκ

verification of it. The reader who desires to examine some of the other interpretations may consult, for the earlier, Bonitz, *Plur. de Gal. iii. 20 Sentent. Examinatæ*, Lips. 1800; for the later, Winer's *Excursus*, and Meyer *in loc.*

21. ὁ οὖν νόμος κ.τ.λ.] 'Is the law then against the promises of God?' the *oὖν* with its full collective force (Klotz, *Devar.* Vol. II. p. 717) gathering up the previous reasoning, and immediately applying its obvious though omitted result; 'does then a confessedly distinctive, ceremonial, and mediatorial system stand in opposition to the promises which God gave to Abraham without a mediator and without any distinctive ceremonies?'

τοῦ Θεοῦ is not without emphasis; 'the promises which rest immediately on God, and were attested by no mediator.' The plural *αἱ ἐπαγγέλ.* is used, as in ver. 16, in ref. to different repetitions of the promise, and to hint at the various ways of fulfilment which it contemplated.

Lachm. places *τοῦ Θεοῦ* in brackets, in consequence of its omission in B, Clarom., Sangerm., but on authority almost obviously insufficient.

εἰ γὰρ ἀδόθη] 'for if there had been given,' proof of the justice of the foregoing declaration μὴ γένοιτο· πρῶτον μὲν ἀπαγορεῖται εἰπών, μὴ γένοιτο· ἔπειτα καὶ κατασκευδεῖται. Chrys. On the use of μὴ γένοιτο see notes on ch. ii. 17.

νόμος ὁ δυνάμενος] 'a law (as the principle) which could have, &c.' This is one out of many instances, both in the N.T. and elsewhere, in which, to give prominence to the defining clause, the anarthrous noun is followed and defined by the article attached to a participle, e.g. Rom. ii. 14, Εθνη τὰ

μὴ νόμον ἔχοντα· see further exx. in Winer, *Gr.* § 20. 4, p. 126; Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* s.v. ὁ, Vol. II. p. 241.

[ζωοποιῆσαι] 'to give life (and blessedness);' 'vivificare, sive vitam dare, idem est quod dare κληρονομίαν, hereditatem vitæ cœlestis atque æternæ; Bull, *Exam. Cens.* xix. 6: see 2 Cor. iii. 6, and comp. Ust. *Lehrb.* I. 4. § 8, p. 61. So also in ver. 12, ζήσει (=ζῶτες αἰώνιος ζει, Olsh. on *Rom.* i. 17) similarly involves the ideas of life and blessedness.

ὅντως κ.τ.λ.] 'verily, &c.' 'apprime notanda est emphasis egregia in adverbio ὅντως, vere;' Bull, *Exam. Cens.* xix. 6.

It has been asked whether St Paul is here reasoning (a) from the effect (*ἐξοντ.*) to the cause (*δικαιοσ.*); or (b) conversely from the cause (*ἐξοντ.*, assumed to mean a new moral life) to the effect (*δικαιοσ.*); compare Neander, *Plant.* Vol. I. p. 418 (Bohn). Certainly the former: *δικαιοσ.* is really, as Ust. properly observes, the middle member between *νόμος* and *ζωή*, without which the law could not have given life. St Paul however thus states his argument: 'lex vitam dare non potest, proinde neque veram justificationem:' Bull, *Ex. Cens. l. c.* ἐκ νόμου] 'would have resulted from the law,' 'would have come from the law as its origin;' not 'would have been suspended on law' (Peile),—a meaning which usually arises from the associated verb, *δεῖν*, *ἀπτάσθαι*, &c. and does not appear to be very common out of Herodotus; comp. Bernhardy, *Synt.* v. 13, p. 227. The order in *Rec.*, *δι τὸν νόμον γένεται* [with D²D³E KL; most mss.; Chrys., Theod., al.], has not sufficient authority, though it must be admitted that owing to the variations in the leading MSS. (B δι νόμῳ, D om. δι, FG om. δι γένεται,

νόμου ἀν δν ή δικαιοσύνη ἀλλὰ συνέκλεισεν η γραφή 22
τὰ πάντα ὑπὸ ἀμαρτίαν, ἵνα η ἐπαγγελία ἐκ πίστεως

ἢ ὅτις ἐκ νόμου ην δν) the text is not wholly free from suspicion.

22. δλλαδ] ‘But on the contrary.’ not δτ, as there is a marked adversative relation between the clauses, and as a statement in reference to the law is about to be made, exactly contrary to the result of the foregoing assumption; see Klotz, *Devar.* Vol. II. p. 2, 3. In Latin this distinction can usually be maintained by the more distinctly adversative *sed* (Vulg., Claram.), not the more simply oppositional *autem*, in which latter particle, ‘discriuen propriæ indicatur, non diversitas;’ Hand, *Tursell.* Vol. I. p. 555, comp. Klotz, Vol. I. p. 361.

συνέκλεισεν η γραφή] ‘the Scripture shut up;’ not equiv. to δ νόμος (Jowett, al.), but with a kind of personification, η θελα γραφή (Theod.), the Scripture of the Old Test. as the representative of Him by whom it was inspired; comp. ver. 8. With regard to the meaning of συγκλεειν (‘concidi sub peccato’ is dicitur qui peccati restu adhuc obstrictus tenetur;’ Bull, *Ez. Cens.* xix. 6), it may be observed (1) that the declaratory sense (‘conclusio declaravit,’ Bull, comp. Baur, *Paulus*, p. 581) does not lie in the verb (see Rom. xi. 32, where the act is ascribed to God) but in the context; and (2) that the prep. σὺν does not imply the similarity of situation of all (Beng.), but simply the idea of contraction (Mey.; ‘ab omni parte clausit,’ Schott 2); comp. συπιέσθω, συμπίγειν’ see Fritz, *Rom.* xi. 32, Vol. II. p. 545, and exx. in Rost u. Palm, *Lex.* s.v. Vol. II. p. 1395, where instances are cited of συγκλ. being used in reference to a single person. On this text and on the general relation of the law to sin,

see the weighty sermon of Usher, *Serm.* v. Vol. XIII. p. 60 sq. (ed. Elringt.).

τὰ πάντα] ‘all.’ The neuter cannot safely be pressed (‘non modo omnes sed etiam omnia,’ Beng.) as if it were specially chosen to include not only men, but all their actions, &c. ‘humana omnia,’ Jowett (comp. Alf., Windisch.); this being neither required by the context (comp. ver. 23), nor justified by St Paul’s usus loquendi: see Rom. xi. 32, where in a passage exactly similar the masc. is used, and comp. Theodoret in loc., who divides the τὰ πάντα into τοὺς πρὸ νόμου and τοὺς δὲ νόμῳ. The exact difference between τοὺς πάντας and τὰ πάντα is perhaps here no greater than between ‘all men’ and ‘all mankind’ (see Ust.): the neuter is idiomatically and instinctively chosen, as best suiting the generality of the declaration: comp. Winer, *Gr.* § 27. 5, p. 160; Seidler on Eur. *Troad.* 426. ἵνα η ἐπαγγελία] ‘in order that the promise,’ object and intent, not the mere recognized consequence (‘quo apparet dari,’ Winer), of the σύγκλεισις, on the part of η γραφή and God its author. The abstract ἐπαγγελία is here, as the context suggests, practically equivalent to the concrete ‘res promissa’ (Schott), scil. κληρονομία: see ver. 18, Heb. x. 36, xi. 39, and comp. *Test.* XII. *Patr.* p. 725, δ Θεός εἰσδέκει θυμᾶς εἰς τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν (cited by Bretsch. *Lex.* s. v.), where this concrete notion is taken in its widest extent, as = η γῆ τῆς ἐπαγγελίας: so κληρονομία, 2 Macc. ii. 4. ἐκ πίστεως ‘I. X.] ‘by faith in Jesus Christ,’ ‘resulting from faith as its source and origin’ (notes, oh. ii. 16); ἐκ πλοτ. being in close union,—not with δοθή (Rück., Conyb.), but with

23 Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δοθῆ τοῖς πιστεύουσιν. πρὸ τοῦ δὲ ἐλθεῖν τὴν πίστιν, ὑπὸ νόμου ἐφρουρούμεθα συγκε-

έπαγγελία (comp. Winer, *Gr.* § 20. 2, p. 123; notes on *Eph.* i. 15), and forming a retrospective antithesis to *ἐκ νόμου*, ver. 21. The genitive 'Ιησ. Χρ.' is *perhaps* here to be taken in its most comprehensive sense; not only 'faith on Christ' (*gen. objecti*), but 'faith as given by Him' (*gen. subjecti*); comp. notes on ch. ii. 16. In the N. T. especially the connexion of the nom. and gen. must often be explained solely from exegetical considerations; see Winer, *Gr.* § 30. 1, p. 168.

τοῖς πιστεύοντις] 'to them that believe,' not 'qui erant credituri' (Grot., Peile), but 'ei qui credunt,' Clarom., al., 'credentibus,' Vulg.; the apparent tautology not being intended merely as emphatic (Winer), but as suitably echoing the *ἐκ πλοτῶν* above. The Galatians were ready to admit that those who believed would be saved, but they doubted whether faith *alone* was sufficient; hence the Apostle interposes the limitation in ref. to the thing promised (ἢ ἐπαγγ. *ἐκ πλοτ.*), and virtually repeats it in ref. to the recipients. The promise was of faith, not of the law; the receivers were not doers of the law, but believers; comp. Meyer *in loc.*

23. πρὸ τοῦ δὲ κ.τ.λ.] 'But before Faith (above mentioned) came;' further account of the relation in which the law stood to faith, δὲ not being here distinctly oppositional, but with some tinge of its primary enumerative force (see Donalds. *Crat.* § 155), adding a further explanation, though in that explanation serving to introduce a contrast; see Klotz, *Devar.* Vol. II. p. 362. With regard to the position of the particle, it may be remarked that there is nothing unusual (opp. to Rück.) in δὲ thus occupying the *third*

place after a prep. and its case; see exx. in Hartung, *Partik.* δέ, I. 6, Vol. I. p. 190. The common-sense principle is that δὲ does not necessarily occupy the *second* place, but the *first possible* place which the internal connexion of the sentence will admit of; see Klotz, *Devar.* Vol. II. p. 378. ὑπὸ νόμου ἐφρουρούμεθα κ.τ.λ.] 'we were kept in ward shut up under the law;' συγκεκλ. being joined, not with *εἰς πλοτῶν* (see following note), but, in a construction similar to that of the preceding verse, with *ὑπὸ νόμου* (Arm., al.): the law in fact is here (as *διαπρίᾳ* in ver. 22) represented as a kind of gaoler into whose custody we were delivered; see Köster, *Stud. u. Krit.* 1854, p. 316. The meaning of φρουρεῖσθαι is thus not merely 'asservari' (Winer, Schott), much less 'obstringi ad obedientiam' (Bretsch.); but, as the definite expression συγκεκλ. distinctly requires, 'custodiri' (Vulg., Clarom., Copt., Αἴθ.), *ἀστερ ἐτειχίψ τοι κατέχεσθαι* Chrys.; comp. Wisdom xvii. 15, ἐφρουρεῖτο εἰς τὴν δούληρον εἰρκτήν κατακλευσθεῖς. The perf. part., it may be observed, correctly expresses the *permanent*, completed, state of the captivity, and is thus not only on critical but exegetical grounds to be preferred to the pres. συγκλεύμενοι [Lachm. with ABD¹FGN; 2 ms.; Clem. (1), Cyr. (3), Dam.], which, though well supported, seems only a conformation to the imperf. ἐφρουρούμεθα so rightly De W., Mey., and the majority of recent critics. εἰς τὴν μελλουσαν κ.τ.λ.] 'for the faith about to be revealed;' object contemplated in the action of φρούρειν, εἰς not being *temporal*, 'usque ad' (Rück., Ust., comp. Copt., Αἴθ.),—a meaning

κλεισμένοι εἰς τὴν μέλλονταν πίστιν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι.
ώστε ὁ νόμος παιδαγωγὸς ημῶν γέγονεν εἰς Χριστόν, 24
ἴνα ἐκ πίστεως δικαιωθῶμεν.

comparatively rare in the N.T. (comp. John xiii. 1), and here certainly superfluous after the predication of time in *πρὸ τοῦ ἔλθεῖν*,—but in its usual ethical meaning of ‘destination for’ (‘in eam fidem,’ Vulg., Clarom.); comp. Winer, *Gr.* § 49. a, p. 353. The clause is thus naturally connected with the finite verb, not with *συγκλ.* (‘conclusi, adeoque adacti ad,’ Beng.),—a construction certainly admissible (see exx. in Schweigh. *Lex. Polyb.* s.v. *συγκλ.*, or Raphael, *Annot.* Vol. II. p. 440 sq.), but open to the serious exegetical objection that faith is not yet represented as existing; see Meyer *in loc.*

μέλλονταν πίστ. διποκ.] The unusual order seems intended to give prominence to *μέλλονταν*, and to present more forcibly the contrast between former captivity and subsequent freedom: compare Rom. viii. 18, *πρὸ τὴν μέλλονταν δόξαν διποκαλυφθῆναι*, where the future glories are set in strong contrast to present calamities; see Fritz, *in loc.* Vol. II. p. 148.

24. **ώστε]** ‘So then,’ ‘itaque,’ Vulg., Clarom.; consequence from the preceding statement; see notes, ch. ii. 13. **παιδαγωγός]** ‘pedagogue,’ ‘pædagogus proprie notat eum qui puerum manu prehensum ad magistrum ducit;’ Schoettg. (*Hor. Hebr.* Vol. I. p. 741); who remarks however that the word was adopted by Rabbinical writers, but with some additional notions of care and guardianship: even among the Greek and Latin writers the idea of guardianship and also of strictness and severity is distinctly prominent; see esp. the exx. in Elsner, *Obs.* Vol.

II. p. 186. The mere idea of leading to Christ (‘vise dux’ [shau-mööt], Copt., ‘ductor,’ *Aeth.*) must not then be retained to the exclusion of those of actual teaching (Arm., Auth.), tutelage, and disciplinary restraint. This pedagogic function of the law was displayed *positively* in warnings and threatenings; *negatively* (the prevailing idea in this place) in awakening the conscience, and bringing a conviction of sin: comp. Usteri, *Lehrb.* I. 5, p. 66. The patristic comments will be found in Suicer, *Thesaur.* s. v. *νόμος*, Vol. II. p. 921; see also Petav. *de Praedest.* x. 26. i sq. Vol. I. p. 464.

ἴνα Χριστόν] ‘for Christ;’ not *temporal* (*άχρις οὐ έλθη Χρ.* see ver. 23), still less *local*, ‘to Christ’ as a διδάσκαλος (*πρὸ τὸν Χρ.* *ἀπήγε*, Theoph., comp. Chrys.), as Christ would thus be represented under two offices, Teacher and (*ἴνα ἐκ πίστ. δικ.*) Atoner, in the same verse. If any trace of a local meaning be retained in translation (e.g. ‘to bring us unto,’ Auth.-Ver.), it must be understood of an ethical arrival (comp. 2 Cor. x. 14), as *εἰς* with persons is not simply equivalent to *πρός*, but involves the idea of mingling with and association; comp. Rom. v. 12, and see Winer, *Gr.* § 49. a, p. 353. **ἴνα ἐκ πίστ.**

δικαιωθ.] ‘to the intent that we might be justified by faith;’ more distinct and specific explanation of the preceding *εἰς Χριστόν*, the emphatic *ἐκ πίστεως*: serving to suggest and enhance the contrast with the non-justifying and merely pedagogic *νόμος*. On the proper force of the *δικαιοῦν* *ἐκ*, see notes on ch. ii. 16.

25 Ἐλθούσης δὲ τῆς πίστεως οὐκέτι
 26 ὑπὸ παιδαγωγόν ἐσμεν. πάντες γὰρ
 νιὸι Θεοῦ ἔστε διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν
 27 Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ· ὅσοι γὰρ εἰς Χριστὸν ἐβαπτίσθητε,

25. Διθούσης [δι] ‘But now that (*this*) *faith is come*,’ contrast between the present freedom and the past pedagogy; Ἐλθούσης, φησι, τῆς πίστεως τῆς τέλεων ὑπὸ παιδαγωγῶν. Theoph. The connexion is so close throughout this latter portion of the chapter, that it is difficult to subdivide it into paragraphs. Meyer, Conyb., al. place a paragraph after ver. 22: it seems however more natural to place it here, as ver. 23, 24, carry out the idea expressed in συνέκλεισεν, ver. 22. ὑπὸ παιδαγωγῶν] ‘under a pedagogue.’ The article is not here latent after the prep. (comp. Winer, Gr. § 19. 2. b, p. 114), but appears studiously omitted (so rightly Copt.); the words being in fact equivalent to ‘under tutelage,’ ‘unter Pädagogengewalt,’ Meyer.

26. πάντες γάρ] ‘For ye all;’ confirmation *a contrario* of the truth of the foregoing words; they were now not *ταῖσις*, but *νιός* (‘flū, emancipati; remoto custode,’ Beng.), and that too not sons of Abraham merely (comp. ver. 7), but sons of God; πρότερος ἔδειξεν διὶ [ἢ πίστις] νιός ἔτοιε τοῦ Ἀβρ. . . . νῦν δὲ ἀποφανεῖ διὶ καὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ Chrys. The *νιός* Θεοῦ, as Theod.-Mops. well observes, includes the idea of τελείωτης, which the preceding metaphor might serve to suggest. Ήδα τῆς πίστεως. ἐν Χρ. ‘Ιησ.] ‘through the faith in Jesus Christ;’ so rightly Syr., Arm. (ed. Zohr.), Syr.-Philox., and Chrys. (ed. Field). Several commentators (Ust., al.; see Hofm. *Schriftb.* Vol. II. 2, p. 152) join ἐν Χρ. ‘Ιησ. with *νιός* Θ. ἔστε, on the ground

By faith in Christ we have become freed from the pedagogy of the law, and are thus all children of God, Abraham’s seed, and heirs of the promise.

that the words would be a superfluous addition to *πίστις*, and that ver. 27 contains the amplification of the expression. But, independently of the awkwardness of adding a second modal clause to *νιός ἔστε*, the recurrence of the formula *πίστις ἐν τῷ Κυρ.* (Xρ.) ‘Ιησ. (Eph. i. 15, Col. i. 4), its grammatical accuracy (Winer, Gr. § 20. 2, p. 123, notes on Eph. i. 15), and the natural coherence of the words, all seem distinctly to suggest the simpler and less dislocated construction. If the article had been inserted, we should then have two ideas conveyed, the latter of which would be explanatory of the former,—‘per fidem, eamque in Chr. Jes. collocatam;’ see Fritz. Rom. iii. 25, Vol. I. p. 195.

27. ὅσοι γάρ] ‘For as many as;’ proof and confirmatory explanation of the preceding assertion. The force of the particle is best explained by the Greek commentators, who refer it to *νιός* Θεοῦ, and base the argument on the fact that Christ was the Son of God: ἐνεδύασθε τὸν Χρ. τὸν ἀληθῶς νιόν τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἐκείνον δὲ ἐνδεδυμένοι εἰκὼν *νιός* Θεοῦ χρηματίζετε Theodoret; see also Chrys. *in loc.* εἰς Χριστόν] ‘into Christ,’ not ‘in Christo,’ Vulg., Clarom., but ‘in Christum,’ Beza (compare Copt. *pichr*); scil. ‘ut Christo addicti essetis,’ Schott, or more strictly, into communion with Him, and incorporation in His mystical body. The meaning of *eis* with *βαπτίζω* appears twofold; (a) ‘unto,’ object, purpose, Matth. iii. 11, Acts ii. 38; see Winer, Gr. § 49. a, p. 354; Bernhardy, *Synt.* v. 11. b. 3, p. 220:

Χριστὸν ἐνεδύσασθε. οὐκ ἔνι Ιουδαῖος οὐδὲ Ἑλλην, 28

(β) 'into,' union and communion with; the context always showing whether it be of the most complete and most mystical nature, as here and Rom. vi. 3 (comp. 1 Cor. xii. 13), or, as in 1 Cor. x. 2, necessarily less comprehensive and significant. We may in conclusion observe that the expression *βαπτ. εἰς τὸ δυομά* (Matth. xxviii. 19, Acts viii. 16, xix. 5, al.) is not identical in meaning with *βαπτ. ἐν τῷ δυόμῳ*. (Tholuck, *Beiträge*, No. 8, p. 49 sq.), but ever implies a spiritual and mystical union with Him in whose name the sacrament was administered; see esp. Stier, *Reden Jesu*, Vol. VI. p. 899.

The meaning of *βαπτίζω τινὰ εἰς τινα* (*εἰς τι*) and *βαπτ. εἰς τὸ δυομά τινος* is discussed at length by Fritz. (*Rom. vi. 3*, Vol. I. p. 359 sq.) in opp. to Bindseil, *Stud. u. Krit.* 1832, p. 410 sqq.; but by no means satisfactorily, as he regards *εἰς* as only implying ethical direction ('aliquem aque ita immersere ut ejus cogitationes in aliquem dirigas'), instead of that mystical incorporation which the passage seems certainly to convey. The patristic comments on this expression will be found in Suicer, *Thes.* Vol. I. p. 624 sq., but are not sufficiently exact.

Χριστὸν ἐνεδύσασθε] ye put on Christ; scil. at your baptism; *ὅτοι γάρ εἰς Χριστὸν ἐβαπτίσθητε* ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐγενήθητε. Chrys. There appears here no allusion to *Heathen* (toga virilis), to *Jewish* (whether at the High Priest's inauguration, Deyling, *Obs.* Vol. III. p. 406 sq., No. 42, or in a cabballistic sense, comp. Schoettg. on *Rom. xiii. 14*, Vol. I. p. 571), or even, though the idea is plausible, to *Christian* customs (at baptism, Bingham, *Antiq.* Book XII. 4. 1 sq.). From the instances Wetst. has collected on *Rom. xiii. 14*, it would appear that *ἐνδύσθαι τινα* is a strong

expression, denoting the complete assumption of the nature, *dec.* of another; e.g. Dion. Halicar. *A. R.* XI. 15. 5 (*τὸν Ταρκίνιον ἐκένων ἐνδύμενον*), Tac. *Ann.* XVI. 28. Thus *ἐνδ.* *Χριστὸν* implies a union with Christ of so true and so complete a nature, that we are brought *εἰς μίαν συγγένειαν καὶ μίαν οἰδαν* (Chrys.) with Him, and, as it is beautifully paraphrased by Calvin, 'coram Deo nomen ac personam Christi geramus, atque in Ipso magis quam in nobismet ipsis censemur:' comp. Bp. Barlow, cited by Waterl. *Works*, Vol. IV. p. 604, and see Suicer, *Thesaur.* s. v. *ἐνδ.*, Vol. I. p. 1112. For a good sermon on this text, see Donne, *Serm.* LXXXVII. Vol. IV. p. 102 (ed. Alf.), and for a notice of the perversion of this text by heretics, Forbes, *Instruct.* X. III. 32 sq., p. 448.

28. οὐκ ἔνι Ι. κ. Λ.] 'There is among (such) neither Jew nor Greek;' digressive statement of the practical result of the *Xp. ἐνδ.*: the new and holy 'habitus' causes all other distinctions, whether of nation (comp. Rom. x. 12), condition, or even sex, to be wholly lost sight of and forgotten. The form *ἔνι* is not for *ἐνεργεῖ*, but, according to Butt. (see Winer, *Gr.* § 14. 2, p. 74), is the lengthened form of the adverbialized prep., to which the requisite person of the auxiliary verb must be supplied. This explanation has in its favour the similar use of *πάρα*, which can scarcely be called a contraction for *πάρεργει*; but against it those exx. where *ἐν* and *ἔνι* are used in the same sentence, e.g. Plat. *Phedo*, p. 77 E, *Iow. ἔνι τις καὶ ἐν ὕπνῳ θεεῖτ.* p. 186 D; and, according to the best reading, 1 Cor. vi. 5. In such cases however *ἔνι* would seem to mean little more than *ἐστι* (*ἔνι· ἐστιν, ὑπάρχει*, Zonar. *Lex.* Vol. I. p. 748), the pre-

οὐκ ἔνι δοῦλος οὐδὲ ἐλεύθερος, οὐκ ἔνι ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ·
29 πάντες γὰρ ὑμεῖς εἰς ἐστὲ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. εἰ δὲ
ὑμεῖς Χριστοῦ, ἄρα τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ σπέρμα ἐστέ, καὶ
ἐπαγγελίαν κληρονόμοι.

positional force being wholly lost; comp. Col. iii. 11. In either case the explanation of the present passage remains the same; ἐτι πλέον διγένεια τὴν ἀγαθότητα τοῦ Θεοῦ ὅπου γάρ τὴν ἵσην δέδωκε δωρέαν Damasc. Deyling illustrates this by reference to the various personal, &c. distinctions among the Jews; *Obs. Sacr.* Vol. I. p. 312 sq., No. 64: Elsner (*in loc.*) notices also the customary exclusion of slaves from certain Heathen rites and temples; *Obs. Vol. II. p. 187.*
ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυν] ‘male and female;’ ‘masculus et femina,’ Clarom., but not Vulg., Goth., Copt., al., which do not preserve the slight change of particle. While the alterable political and social distinctions are contrasted by οὐδέ, the unalterable human one of sex is expressed by καὶ. Mark x. 6, ἀπὸ δὲ ἀρχῆς κτίσεως ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ ἐποιησεν αὐτούς. comp. 1 Tim. ii. 13. This latter distinction is of course noticed, not in its mere physical, but in its ethical aspect, the subordination of the wife to the husband (Olah.). This, though an unchangeable law of our species when considered κατὰ σάρκα, Eph. v. 22, al., is lost sight of in this ἀγνοήτηρα πρᾶς τὸν Χριστὸν ἔνωσις Chrys. πάντες γάρ] ‘for ye all.’ proof of the preceding statement; τῷ ἕνα τύπον καὶ μιαν μορφὴν ἐνδεδύσθαι, τὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ Οἰκου. The reading ἀπαντ. (Lachm.) seems an early gloss. εἰς] ‘one,’ i.e. one person; τὸ εἰς ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐν σῶμα Theodoret: comp. Lucian, *Toxaris*. 46 (cited by Wetst.) εἰς ἀνθρώπος βῆτες οὐτα βιοῦμεν. The concluding words ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ obviate all

mistakes, by defining in whom, and in whom alone, this union was fully realized.

29. εἰ δὲ ὑμεῖς] ‘But if ye;’ resumption of the argument after the short digression of ver. 28, the emphasis resting slightly on ὑμεῖς: ‘as ye, to whom I am speaking, and who have felt such doubts on the subject, have put on Christ, ye must be what He is (ver. 16), the seed of Abraham.’ The reading εἰς ἐστε ἐν Χρ. Ἰησ. instead of Χριστοῦ, though found in D'EFG; Clarom.; Ambrost. is clearly an exegetic gloss.

τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ σπέρμα] ‘Abraham's seed;’ τοῦ Ἀβρ. being put forward with a slight emphasis, and standing in correlation to Χριστοῦ to give force and perspicuity to the conclusion; εἰ δὲ ὑμεῖς ἐστὲ Χριστοῦ μορφὴ καὶ σῶμα, εἰκὼν τοῦ Ἀβρ. ἐστὲ σπέρμα’ Οἰκου; comp. Theod. *in loc.*, and esp. Theod.-Mops. (p. 126, ed. Fritz.), who has well elucidated the argument.

καὶ ἐπαγγ. κληρονόμοι] ‘heirs according to, or by way of, promise;’ not by any legal observances. The κληρονόμια is now stated absolutely; they were κληρονόμοι, not merely of Abraham, nor even τῇς ἐπαγγελίας (Theod.-Mops.), but simply of all that which was involved in it, salvation and the kingdom of Christ; comp. Meyer *in loc.* The declaration of ver. 7 is now at length substantiated and expanded by 22 verses of the deepest, most varied, and most comprehensive reasoning that exists in the whole compass of the great Apostle's writings. The καὶ before καὶ ἐπαγγ., adopted by Rec. with FGKL; mss.; Syr.

As every heir is under tutelage, so before Christ came we all were under bondage, but now have become free sons and inheritors.

Λέγω δέ, ἐφ' ὅσον χρόνον ὁ κληρο- IV.
νόμος νήπιος ἔστιν, οὐδὲν διαφέρει δού-
λου, κύριος πάντων ὢν, ἀλλὰ ὑπὸ ἐπι- 2

(both), Goth., Aeth.; Chrys., Theod., is now rightly omitted by most critical editors.

CHAPTER IV. I. λέγω δέ] ‘Now I say;’ further and more explanatory proof of the assertion that we are heirs, suggested by the term *κληρονόμοι* (ch. iii. 29) and the comparisons it involves: comp. ch. v. 16, Rom. xv. 8 (*Rec.*), where the use of λέγω δέ in introducing a *continued* explanatory argument rather than merely elucidating a statement or expression that had preceded (comp. ch. iii. 17, τοῦτο δέ λέγω· 1 Cor. i. 12, λέγω δέ τοῦτο· 1 Cor. vii. 29, τοῦτο δέ φημι) seems analogous to the present.

δ κληρονόμος] ‘the heir,’ i.e. ‘every heir.’ compare δ μεστῆς, ch. iii. 20, Winer, *Gr.* § 18. I, p. 97. There are some exegetical difficulties in this and the following verse, arising from the fact that, while the nature of the comparison (see Brown), as well as the words δχρι τῆς προθεσμίας τοῦ παρός, would seem to imply that the father was *alive*, the expression κύριος πάντων ὢν, and the term ἐπίτροπος (but see below) might be thought to imply that he was *dead*. The latter view is taken by Theodore and the majority of ancient (silex Chrys.), with several modern commentators; the former is ably advocated by Neubour, *Bibl. Brem. Class.* Vol. v. p. 40 (cited by Wolf), and also many recent expositors. Grotius endeavours to escape the difficulty by representing the father *absent* on travel; compare Aelian, *Var. Hist.* III. 26, cited below in note ver. 2. The question however is really of little moment: St

Paul is engaged so entirely in the simple comparison of the circumstances of the manhood of the earthly *κληρονόμος* with those of the manhood of believers who lived under the law (ver. 3), that the subordinate question of the life, death, or absence of the father of the *κληρονόμος* passes wholly out of sight; comp. Alf. *in loc.*
νήπιος] ‘an infant, a minor;’ *δηῆς*, as opposed to *ἔφηβος*, the technical term for one who had attained his majority; see Smith, *Dict. Antiq.* s. v. *ἔφηβος*, and reff. in Rost u. Palm, *Lex.* Vol. I. p. 1282. There does not seem any sufficient reason for departing from this usual view of *νήπιος* (opp. to Bagge *in loc.*), or with Chrys., al., for introducing any reference to the ethical meaning of weakness of understanding.

οὐδὲν διαφέρει δούλου] ‘differs in nothing from a bond-servant;’ ‘imo servo [ταιδαγωγῷ] subjectus est;’ Erasm. The very apposite quotation from Dio Chrys. XV. p. 240, adduced by Wetst. *in loc.*, is too long for citation, but is worth referring to.

κύριος πάντων ὢν] ‘though he be lord of all;’ concessive use of the participle: comp. Donalds. *Gr.* § 621; Krüger, *Sprachl.* § 56. 13. 1 sq. It does not seem necessary for the sake of preserving the image of a *living* father to understand these words as *prospective*; the heir was the *κύριος* (Grot. compares the use of ‘herus minor’ in Lat. comedy) in right of birth and condition.

2. ἐπιτρόπους] ‘overlookers, guardians.’ The latter is the usual meaning of the word in relation to children (comp. Isaeus, *Hær. Cleonym.* § 10,

*τρόπους ἐστὶν καὶ οἰκονόμους ἄχρι τῆς προθεσμίας
3 τοῦ πατρός. οὕτως καὶ ἡμεῖς, ὅτε ἡμεν νήπιοι, ὑπὸ*

p. 4, ed. Schöm., τῶν ἔχθιστον τῶν
οἰκεῖων ἐπιτρόπων καταλιπεῖν ib. *Hær.*
Dicæog. § 10; *Plut. Lycurg.* § 3,
τοὺς τῶν δρφανῶν βασιλέων ἐπιτρό-
πους), and that in which it appears to
have been adopted by Hebrew writers;
comp. Schoettg. *Hor. Hebr. in loc.*; Selden, *de Success.* ch. 9, Vol. II. p.
25. It seems here however better
to adopt the more general meaning
'overlooker, one entrusted with the
charge of anything' (comp. Aristoph.
Ecccl. 212, ἐπιτρόπους καὶ ταμίας·
Xenoph. *Econ.* XII. 2, ἐπιτρόπους ἐν
τοῖς δύροις), and not to embarrass
the passage with terms which might
bring in irrelevant considerations (the
father's being alive or dead) into the
present simple comparison. We may
however not unsuitably compare
Aelian, Var. Hist. III. 26, ἐπιτρ. καὶ
τοῦ ταῦτος καὶ τῶν χρημάτων, where
the context distinctly shows that the
father was *alive*, though absent.

οἰκο-
νόμους] 'stewards,' **حُكَّمٌ** [dominos domus]
[Syr., 'actores,' Vulg., Clarom. [comp. Plin. *Ep.* III.
19], less accurately, Goth. *faufragag-
gam* [*Vorsteher*]; managers of the pro-
perty of the *κληρονόμος*, and standing
in the same relation to his *estate* as the
ἐπιτρόποι did to his *education* and
general bringing up; comp. Plutarch,
Educ. § 7, δοιδιων...τοὺς δὲ οἰκονόμους,
τοὺς δὲ δανειστὰς. Most commenta-
tors not inaptly cite the case of
Eliezer, Gen. xv. 2; comp. xxiv. 2.
Illustrations from Roman law (Bagge,
al.) do not seem here in point, as the
comparison is simple and general.
τῆς προθεσμίας] 'the time appointed
(beforehand)', 'præfinitum tempus,'
Vulg. The term *προθεσμία*, scil. ὥρα
or ἡμέρα (for the distinction between

these, see Bagge *in loc.*), is properly
the term limited for bringing actions
or prosecutions, the time fixed by
the statute of limitations, 'Tag der
Verjährung' (see Smith, *Dict. of
Antiq.* s.v., and exx. in Rost u. Palm,
Lex. s.v.); thence, any *pre-appointed*
time or day: see the numerous exx.
in Wetst. *in loc.*; Kypke, *Obs.* Vol.
II. p. 279; Krebs, *Obs.* p. 322. In
eccles. writers *προθεσμία* is sometimes
used for the time assigned for repen-
tance before excommunication; see
Bingham, *Antiq.* XVI. 2. 7. It
may be observed that as the termina-
tion of nonage was *fixed* in Hebrew
(13 years and a day for males, 12
years and a day for females; Selden,
de Success. ch. 9, Vol. II. p. 25), as
well as in Greek and Roman law, the
dependence of the *ἡ προθεσμία on the*
father must be explained, either (a)
by the very reasonable assumption
that St Paul is here speaking theo-
logically rather than juridically; or,
(b) less probably, by the supposition
that he was here referring, with tech-
nical exactness, to an extended par-
ental authority which the Galatians
appear to have possessed; see Göttl.
Gesch. d. Rom. Staatsverf. p. 109, 517
(cited by B.-Crus.), and comp. Caesar,
Bell. Gall. VI. 19.

3. οὕτως καὶ ἡμεῖς] 'So we also;'
application of the preceding state-
ments; καὶ, as is usual in comparative
sentences, bringing into prominence
and throwing a slight emphasis on
the contrasted member of the com-
parison; see notes *on Eph.* v. 23.
It has been doubted whether the *ἡμεῖς*
are Jews (Chrys., Theod.), Gentiles
(Aug.), or both equally (Win., Mey.).
The most natural reference seems to
be (a) to Jews, primarily and princi-

*τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου ἡμεν δεδουλωμένοι. ὅτε δὲ 4
ηλθεν τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ χρόνου, ἔξαπέστειλεν ὁ Θεὸς*

pally, as the nature of the preceding argument seems distinctly to require; but also (b) secondarily, Gentiles, in accordance with the nature of the succeeding argument. *τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου*] ‘the rudiments of the world.’ It is very difficult to decide on the exact meaning of these words. Taken separately, *στοιχεῖον* is used in the N.T. both in a physical (2 Pet. iii. 10, 12) and an ethical sense (Heb. v. 12). *Κόσμος* again has practically at least three meanings; *physical* (Math. xxv. 34), *collective* (mankind, Joh. iii. 16), and *ethical* (1 Cor. ii. 12). From the combination of both words a great variety of interpretations have arisen, all however separable into two general classes, (1) Physical; *elementa mundi*, either, (a) festivals of Judaism, Chrysost.; (b) Zabianism, August.; or (c) abstractedly, religion in sensible forms, Neand. *Planting*, Vol. I. p. 465 (Bohn); (2) Ethical; *rudimenta mundi*, first, but not necessarily erroneous (comp. *Aeth.*) principles of religious knowledge among men, whether (a) Jews (De W.); or (b) Jews and heathens (Meyer). Grammatical considerations seem in favour of (1); for *στοιχεῖα*, in the sense *rudimenta*, would appear to require, as in Heb. v. 12, a gen. *objecti*, and not as here a gen. *subjecti* (see Neander *l.c.*); still *κόσμον* need not be considered a pure gen. *subj.*, the connexion between the nom. and gen. being often somewhat lax; see Winer, *Gr.* § 30. 2, p. 168 sq. Exegetical considerations must be also extended to ver. 9, and to Col. ii. 8, 20, where the same words occur. These we can only briefly notice. In Col. ii. 8, the parallelism with *παρδόσις τῶν διθρώπων* seems so distinct,

and so palpably in favour of (2), as to outweigh the argument drawn by Schneckenb. from the supposed physical use of *κόσμος* in ver. 20. The use of the term *φιλοσοφία* seems also there to point slightly more to *heathen* rudiments (see notes in *loc.*), while on the contrary in Col. ii. 20, and below, verse 9, the reference seems mainly to *Jewish* rudiments. All these conflicting views being considered, we seem here justified in deciding in favour of (2) generally; assigning however to the words (as both *ἡμεῖς* and the nature of the argument require) a primary, but by no means exclusive, reference to the Jews. For further notices of this doubtful expression, see Eaur, *Paulus*, p. 594 sq.; and for a defence of the physical meaning, Schneckenburg. in *Theol. Jahrb.* 1848, p. 444 sq., and Hilgenf. *Galat.* p. 68 sq. The application to the ceremonial law will be found, Petav. de *Prædest.* x. 23. 12, Vol. I. p. 456. *δεδουλωμένοι*] ‘in a state of slavery,’ the perf. pass. part. marking the permanent nature and continuance of the *δουλεῖα* comp. Winer, *Gr.* § 45. 1, p. 305. The verb *ἡμερ* may be regarded either as in union with *δεδούλ.* and as forming a compound tense, or as in more immediate connexion with *ὑπὸ τὰ στοιχεῖα*: the latter is most probable, as forming the best parallel to *ὑπὸ ἐπιγράψους ἐτύν* so distinctly Copt., and perhaps Vulg., Clarom., ‘sub elementis mundi eramus servientes;’ see Meyer *in loc.*

4. *τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ χρόνου*] ‘the fulness of the time,’ i.e. the moment which makes the time complete, answering to the *έχρι τῆς προθεσμίας τοῦ πατρός*, ver. 2; see Stier, *Ephes.*

τὸν νιὸν αὐτοῦ, γενόμενον ἐκ γυναικός, γενόμενον ὑπὸ νόμου, ἵνα τοὺς ὑπὸ νόμου ἔξαγοράσῃ, ἵνα τὴν νίο-

Vol. I. p. 203, and comp. Usteri, *Lehrb.* II. 1, p. 83. These words have been the subject of considerable discussion. Taken in its most general view πλήρωμα has two meanings; (1) Active; τὸ πλήρη ποιεῖν, *implendi actio*, not *id quod implet, as Fritz. (on Rom. xi. 12) has satisfactorily proved against Storr, *Opusc.* I. p. 144: (2) Passive; either (a) in the less usual sense *id quod impletum est*, or (β) in the more common and regular sense *id quo res impletur*; comp. I Cor. x. 26, Mark viii. 20. Hence τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ χρ. will seem to be ‘*id quo temporis spatium impletur, sc. expletur*;’ the idea being rather that of a temporal space (so to speak) filled up as it were by the flowing in of time; see Olsh. *in loc.*, and comp. Herod. III. 22, δύδωκοντα δὲ θρεα βόης πλήρωμα δεδρὶ μακρύτατον. Fritz. on the contrary, but with less probability, regards πλήρωμα as the abstract notion of the concrete idea πλήρης, ‘temporia plenitas, i. q. plenum tempus;’ see however his very valuable note, *Rom. l.c.*, Vol. II. p. 469 sq. The doctrinal meaning of this term is investigated at length in Hall, *Bamp. Lect.* for 1797, esp. Serm. VIII. p. 211 sq.; see also the good sermons on this text by Andrewes, *Serm. IV.* Vol. I. p. 49, and Donne, *Serm. III.* Vol. I. p. 39 (ed. Alf.). **ἴσαντοτελεύτην** ‘sent forth,’ ‘emissit, ex calo a se,’ Beng.; comp. Acts vii. 12, xi. 22, xvii. 14. On the doctrinal questions connected with this word, see Petav. *Trin. VIII.* I. 10. γενόμ. ἐκ γυναικός] ‘born of a woman,’ defining participial clause added to attest the pure manhood of Christ, and to obviate any misconception of the meaning of the clause that follows;*

comp. Usteri, *Lehrb.* II. 2, 4, p. 311 sq. No doctrinal stress is thus to be laid either on γυναικός (‘absque virili semine,’ Est.), or on the prep. (τὸ δὲ ἐκ ἐμέλλε...παραδηλοῦν τὴν κοινωνίαν τῆς φύσεως τοῦ τικτομένου πρὸς τὴν γεννήσασαν Basil, *De Sp. Sanct.* v. 12; compare Theophyl., *Ecum.*); γυναικός being only used to mark our Lord’s true humanity, and ἐκ having only its usual and natural ref. to the circumstances of birth: comp. Matth. I. 16, John iii. 6; and see Rost u. Palm, *Lex. s.v.* III. 2, Vol. I. p. 818; Winer, *Gr.* § 47. b, p. 327, 328. For a sound and striking sermon on this verse, and on the general relation of woman to man, see Jackson, *Creed*, Vol. VI. p. 226 (Oxf. 1844). The reading γενόμενον, (found in some cursive mss., Ath., Theod., al.) has every appearance of being an explanatory gloss. γενόμενον ἐπὸ νόμου] ‘born under the law,’ ‘natum inter Iudeos legi Mos. obnoxios,’ Schott; second defining clause added to show that not only was Christ truly man (*γενόμ.* ἐκ γυν.), but also a true member of the Jewish nation (*γενόμ.* ἐπὸ νόμ.), and standing in the same religious relations as all other Israelites; see Olshaus. and Turner *in loc.*, and comp. Andrewes, *Serm. I.* Vol. I. p. 13 (A.-C. L.). On the most suitable rendering of γενόμενον, see notes to *Transl.*

5. ἵνα τοὺς ὑπὸ νόμου ἔσῃ.] ‘In order that He might ransom those under the law,’ first gracious purpose of God’s having sent forth His Son thus γενόμ. ἐκ γυναικ. and thus γενόμ. ὑπὸ νόμου,—the ransom of those who were under the same religious obligations as those under which our Lord vouchsafed to be born. The redemp-

Θεσίαν ἀπολάβωμεν. ὅτι δέ ἔστε νιοί, ἐξυπέστειλεν

tion was, as De W. (after Beng.) rightly maintains, not merely from the curse, but from the *bondage* of the law; comp. ver. 3. On the meaning of *ἔκαγος*, see notes on ch. iii. 13.

ἴνα τὴν νιόθεστην ἀπολαβόμεν.] ‘in order that we might receive the adoption of sons;’ second gracious purpose of God, resulting from the first, the adoption as sons not only of Jews, but of all men (*ὑμεῖς*), of all those whose nature our Lord vouchsafed to assume. The first *ἴνα* thus, by a kind of *χιασμός* (Jelf, *Gr.* § 904. 3) found occasionally elsewhere in the Apostle’s writings (comp. *Philem.* 5), refers to the second participial member *γενόμενοι*. *ἄντοι* *νόμοις*, while the second *ἴνα* refers to the first and less circumscribed *γενόμενοι*. *ἐκ γυναικῶν*. For examples of a double *ἴνα* thus appended to a single finite verb, comp. ch. iii. 14, *Eph.* v. 26, 27. *τὴν νιόθεσταν* ‘the adoption of sons;’ comp. *Rom.* viii. 15, 23, ix. 4, *Eph.* i. 5. The interpretation, ‘*conditio filiorum, sonship*,’ adopted by several commentators (see *Ust. in loc.* and *Lehrb.* II. 1. 2, p. 186, note) both here and *Rom.* viii. 15, has been convincingly refuted by Fritz. *Rom. l. c.*, Vol. II. p. 137 sq. We were formerly in the light of servants, but now have been adopted and are free sons. Neander traces a threefold gradation in this adoption; (a) as existing but not appropriated; (b) as appropriated through faith in Christ; (c) as perfected by a full communion in his blessedness and glory: *Planting*, Vol. I. p. 477 (Bohn).

ἀπολάβεσθεν ‘might receive.’ The special force of the prep. has been somewhat differently explained. Of the two more ancient interpretations, (a) that of Chrys., *καλῶς εἶτεν ἀπολαβεῖσθεν*

δεικνὺς ὀφειλομένην, though lexically admissible (see Winer, *de Verb. Comp.* Fasc. IV. p. 13) does not harmonize with the context, as the *νιόθεστα* is not *here* alluded to as the subject of promise: again (b), that of Aug., ‘non dixit accipiamus sed recipiamus,’ though equally admissible on lexical grounds (opp. to Meyer; comp. Herod. I. 61, and see Rost u. Palm, *Lex.* s. v. *ἀπό*, ε, and ib. s. v. *ἀπολαμβάνειν*) is more than doubtful in point of doctrine, as the correct dogmatical statement, ‘ut quod perdidimus in Adam ... hoc in Christo recuperemus’ (Iren.; see Bull, *State of Man*, p. 492, Oxf. 1844), can only be applied to what Adam had before his fall, and not to a gracious gift which was not bestowed on him. It seems best then to fall back on the general local meaning of *ἀπό*, and to regard the verb as hinting at receiving from an imaginary place where the things given might be conceived as having been laid up in store; ‘*ἀπολαμβάνει* dicuntur imprimis illi, qui quae ipsi destinata et quasi reposita sunt accipiunt, Col. iii. 24, 2 Joh. 8;’ Winer, *l. c.*; add Luke xvi. 25, *ἀπέλαβες τὰ δύαθά σου*, which the context shows could scarcely receive any other interpretation.

6. *ὅτι δὲ κ.τ.λ.*] ‘And as a proof that ye are sons,’ ‘quemadmodum autem’ [*kamasa*], οὐκ, the δὲ introducing with a faintly oppositional force the demonstration of the assertion. It is difficult to decide whether *ὅτι* is here *causal* (‘quoniam,’ Vulg., Clarom., Syr.-Philox.) or, more probably, *demonstrative* (πόθεν δῆλον *ὅτι*, Chrys., Theoph., ΟΞΕΙΟΝ., and by obvious inference Theod. and Theod.-Mops.). Independently of the authority of the Greek commentators, which in such cases is very great, we seem justified

ό Θεὸς τὸ Πνεῦμα τοῦ νιοῦ αὐτοῦ εἰς τὰς καρδίας
7 ἡμῶν, κράζον Ἀββᾶ ὁ πατήρ. ὥστε οὐκέτι εἰ δοῦλος
ἀλλὰ νιός· εἰ δὲ νιός, καὶ κληρονόμος διὰ Θεοῦ.

7. διὰ Θεοῦ] This reading, which *Tisch.* has adopted with ABC^N(FG διὰ Θεόν); 17; Aug., Boern., Vulg., Copt.; Clem., Bas., Cyr., Did.; Ambr., Aug.,

by the context in adopting the *latter* view; since, on the one hand, the causal interpretation seems to interfere with the easy transition from the declaration of ver. 4, 5, to the consequence in ver. 7; and, on the other hand, the demonstrative *ὅτι* seems to accord better with the emphatic position and the tense of *ἔστε*. The sentence is thus what is called brachylogical, ‘and as a proof that ye really are sons,’—a construction to which De W. and Alf. object, but which still seems perfectly correct and admissible; see Winer, *Gr.* § 66. I. p. 546; Fritz, *Rom.* ii. 14, Vol. I. p. 117; Lücke on *I John* v. 9. The insertion of *τοῦ Θεοῦ* after *νιοῦ*, in DE FG; Clarom., Demid., Tol., Goth., al., and Lat. Ff., seems to be an obvious explanatory addition.

τὸ Πνεῦμα τοῦ νιοῦ αὐτοῦ] ‘the Spirit of His Son,’ scil. the Holy Spirit (‘Spiritus Christi quia per Christum obtinetur, Joh. xiv. 16;’ Grot.), here suitably thus designated in harmony with the preceding mention of our relation to God as *sons* (Ust.); comp. Rom. viii. 9, where *Ιη. Θεοῦ* and *Ιη. Χριστοῦ* appear interchangeable. On the doctrinal significance of this passage—that it is the ‘substantia’ and ‘persona’ of the Spirit which dwells in the hearts of believers (1 Cor. vi. 19), comp. Petav. *Trin.* VIII. 4. 6, Vol. II. p. 459; and on the *heart* as the seat of the inworking power of God, Beck, *Seelenl.* § 27, p. 107. In the following words *Rec.* reads *ὑμῶν* with D^EEKL; mss.; several Vv. and

Ff.: but with slightly less probability than *ἡμῶν*, which is found in ABC D^IFGN; many mss.; Amit. (Flor.), Clarom., Ath. (2), and many Ff., and is adopted by the best recent editors. ‘Ἀββᾶ ὁ πατήρ] ‘Abba father;’ Mark xiv. 36, Rom. viii. 15. In this solemn expression ὁ πατήρ (nom. for vocat., Winer, *Gr.* § 29. 2, p. 164) does not seem appended to the Aramaic ‘Ἄββᾶ as a mere explanation of it, ‘Abba, id est, Pater’ (Beza); nor yet united with it to indicate the union of Jews and Gentiles (‘Hebraeum verbum ad Judeos, Græcum ad gentes...pertinet,’ Aug.; comp. Andrewes, *Serm.* iv. Vol. I. p. 60): but is appy. blended with it as making up the ‘solemnis formula’ of the early Christian prayers. The Aramaic title under which our Lord addressed His heavenly Father was probably at a very early period (hence Mark, *l. c.*) united to the Greek synonym in reverent and affectionate remembrance of Him who had taught and enabled us truly to call God Our Father, and thence used as a single form in all *more fervent* addresses to God; comp. Schoettg. *Hor. Hebr.* Vol. I. p. 252, where instances are given of addresses to God in which Hebrew and Greek words are somewhat similarly united. Whether there is here any allusion to the fact that among the Jews a *freeman* might by addressing any one with the title Abba prepare the way for adoption by him (Selden, *de Success.* ch. 4, Vol. II. p. 15), seems very doubtful.

7. ὥστε κ. τ. λ.] ‘So then,’ ‘Conse-

How then can ye now
turn back again to the
bondage of rudiments, as alas! ye are doing?

'Αλλὰ τότε μὲν οὐκ εἰδότες Θεὸν 8

Pol., Bed., Ambrst. (*Zachm.*, *Mey.*), appears on the whole the most satisfactory. Fritz. (*Opusc.* p. 148) supports the *Rec.* on paradigmatic considerations (Xρ. and Θε. being confused with one another, hence omission of διὰ Χριστοῦ—then διὰ Θε. by omission of Xρ.) which seem somewhat precarious. In answer to the internal objection of Usteri that the inheritance is never represented by St Paul as coming διὰ Θεοῦ (comp. however ver. 5), it may be remarked, that Θεοῦ may fairly be taken in its widest sense, as including the three Persons of the blessed Trinity, just separately mentioned; see Windischm. *in loc.*

quently; conclusion from the statements in the two preceding verses, *were* with its usual and proper force denoting the ‘*consecutionem alicujus rei ex antecedentibus;*’ Klotz, *Derar.* Vol. II. p. 771. On the force of this particle with the indic. and infin., see notes on ch. ii. 13; and for its use with the imperative, notes on *Phil.* ii. 12. οὐκέτι εἶ] ‘thou art no more, as thou wert when in bondage under rudiments of the world.’ Meyer finds a climax of person in διολάβωμεν, ver. 5, ἔστε, ver. 6, εἰ, ver. 7, the mode of address becoming more and more personal and individualizing: for further exx. of this use of the second person in more cogent addresses, see *Rom.* xi. 17, xii. 20, xiii. 4, xiv. 4, 1 *Cor.* iv. 7, al., and comp. notes, ch. ii. 18.

εἰ δὲ υἱός, καὶ κληρονόμος] ‘but if a son (not a slave), then also an heir;’ comp. *Rom.* viii. 17, εἰ δὲ τέκνα, καὶ κληρονόμοι. Both these passages must appy. be explained on the principles of the Roman, and not of the Hebrew law. According to the latter, only sons (legitimate, ‘ex concubinis,’ or ‘ex incestu,’ but not ‘ex ancillis et Gentilibus,’ Seld. *de Succ.* ch. 3) succeeded to the inheritance; the firstborn having double: according to the former *all* children, male or female; ‘nec interest utrum naturales sint an adoptivi,’ Gajus, *Com. Inst.* III. § 2 (cited by

Fritz.). It is scarcely necessary to observe that νὺς is not to be pressed, being simply, as Fritz. observes, in antithesis to δοῦλος: women are distinctly included in ch. iii. 28. The whole subject is ably investigated by Fritzsche, *Fritzschi. Opusc.* p. 143—149.

8. δλλαδ] ‘*Howbeit;*’ appeal based on the preceding statements, and involving a strong *contrast* between their past and present states. The adversative δλλὰ has thus here no species of affirmative force (Ust.),—a meaning however which may be justified, see Klotz, *Derar.* Vol. II. p. 14,—but introduces an explanation of the words οὐκέτι εἶ κ.τ.λ. by the very contrast which it states; ‘now ye are free children of God,—then (before the time of your νιοθεσία) ye knew Him not, and were the bond-servants of demons.’ It need scarcely be added that τότε does not refer to ver. 3 (Wiener, Schott), still less is to be regarded as equivalent to πδλαι (Koppe), but merely marks the period when they were not, as they now are, sons; ‘quasi digito intento designat omne tempus quod ante vocationem Galatarum exierat.’ Grot.

οὐκ εἰδότες] ‘*ignorantes;*’—an historic fact; contrast 1 *Thess.* iv. 5, τὰ μὴ εἰδότα τὸν Θεόν, where they are only so characterized by the writer; and

9 ἐδουλεύσατε τοῖς φύσει μὴ οὖσιν θεοῖς· νῦν δὲ γνόντες Θεόν, μᾶλλον δὲ γνωσθέντες ὑπὸ Θεοῦ, πῶς

see Winer, *Gr.* § 55. 5, p. 428 sq. It may be observed that with certain participles *oὐ* regularly and formally coalesces, so as to express one single idea; see Gayler, *Part. Neg.* p. 287. [*ἐδουλεύσατε*] ‘were slaves,’ emphatic, and, as in ver. 9, in a *bad sense*. The proper force of the aorist, as marking an action that took place in and belongs wholly to the past, is here distinctly apparent; comp. the exx. in Krüger, *Sprachl.* § 53. 5. 1; Scheuerl. *Synt.* § 32. 2, p. 331 sq.; and for some excellent remarks on the use of this tense, Schmalf. *Synt. d. Gr. Verb.* § 60 sq., and esp. Fritz, *De Aor. Vi.*, Frankf. 1837. This passage has been pressed into the controversy respecting *δουλεῖα* and *λαρπεῖα*, and is noticed in Forbes, *Instruct.* VII. 1, p. 331 sq.

[*τοῖς φύσει μὴ οὖσιν θεοῖς*] ‘which by nature are not gods;’ *φύσει* being emphatic, and serving to convey an unconditioned denial of their being gods *at all*; comp. 1 Cor. x. 20. The order in *Rec.* *τοῖς μὴ φύσει οὖσι θεοῖς* [D³FGKL; mss.; Syr.-Phil.; Chrys., Theod., al.] is much less expressive, as implying that the false gods were thought to be true gods, though not naturally so, and is decidedly inferior in external authority to that adopted in the text, which has the support of ABCD¹D³EN; 6 mss.; Syr. (plural), Vulg., Goth., Copt.; Athan. (4), Nyss. (4), al., and is adopted by the best recent editors. On the meaning of *φύσει* ‘substantially,’ ‘essentially,’ and the connexion of the verse with the argument for the divinity of Christ, see Waterl. *Second Def. Qu. 24*, Vol. II. p. 722.

μὴ οὖσι is a subjective negation, and states the view in which they were regarded by the writer; see above,

and comp. the numerous exx. cited by Winer, *Gr.* § 55. 5, p. 428. The student must be reminded that *μή* with participles is the prevailing usage in the N. T., so that while *oὐ* with participles may be pressed, it is well to be cautious with regard to *μή*; see notes on 1 *Thess.* ii. 15.

9. [*γνόντες Θεόν*] ‘after having known God;’ temporal participle here expressing an action preceding that specified by the finite verb; see Winer, *Gr.* § 45. 1, p. 306, and notes on *Eph.* iv. 8. Olsh. finds a climax in *εἰδότες*, *γνόντες*, and *γνωσθέντες*: the first, merely outward knowledge that God is; the second, the inner essential knowledge in activity; the third, the passive knowledge of God in love. The distinction between the two latter (see below) seems correct, but that between *εἰδ.* and *γν.* very doubtful, especially after the instances cited by Meyer, viz. John vii. 27, viii. 55, 2 Cor. v. 16.

[*μᾶλλον* § 4] ‘*imo vero*,’ ‘*vel potius*,’ Rom. viii. 34; ‘*corrigentis est ut sepiissime*,’ Stallb. Plat. *Symp.* p. 173 E: see exx. collected by Raphel in loc.

[*γνωσθέντες*] ‘being known;’ ‘cogniti,’ Vulg., Clarom. [cognoti]; not ‘approbati’ (Grot.), nor even ‘acknowledged as His own’ (Ust., comp. Ewald), still less ‘scire facti’ (Beza); but simply, in the usual and regular meaning of the word in the N. T., ‘known,’ ‘recognized;’ see 1 Cor. viii. 3, xiii. 12; and comp. Winer, *Gr.* § 39. 3, p. 235. Before the time of their conversion the Galatians were not known by God, had not become the objects of His divine knowledge; now they were known by Him and endowed with spiritual gifts; *ab ᾧ οὐκ ἔτεστάσαρο* Chrys. The distinction drawn by Olsh.

ἐπιστρέφετε πάλιν ἐπὶ τὰ ἀσθενῆ καὶ πτωχὰ στοιχεῖα, οἵς πάλιν ἄνωθεν δουλεύειν θέλετε; ἡμέρας παρα-

10

(above) between *γνώντες*, *cognitio activa*, knowledge, which must be, if genuine, preceded by *γνωσθείς*, *cognitio passiva*, love (hence the corrective *μᾶλλον δέ*), seems borne out by 1 Cor. l.c. (on which see Beng.); comp. Neaud. *Plant.* Vol. I. p. 157, note (Bohn).

πάλι] ‘qui fit ut?’ ‘how cometh it that?’
see ch. ii. 14. *ἐπιστρέφετε πάλιν]* ‘turn back again.’ ‘con-
vertimini iterum,’ Vulg., Clarom.,

ஓΔΩΣ **ஓல** [iterum conversi-
estis] Syr.; *πάλιν* not being the Homeric and Hesiodic ‘retro’ (an idea involved in *ἐπιστρέψει*, Matth. xii. 44, 2 Pet. ii. 22), but *denuo*, *iterum*, the more common meaning in the N. T.; see exx. in Bretsch. *Lex.* s. v. The lapse of the Galatians into Judaism is thus represented as a *relapse* into those *στοιχεῖα* among which Judaism was included: ‘*πάλιν* non rem eandem respicit sed similem;’ Glass. ap. Pol. *Syn.* in loc.

τὰ δυθενή κ. τ. λ.] ‘the weak and beggarly elements;’ *δυθενή* as having no power to justify or promote salvation, *πτωχὰ* as having no rich dowry of spiritual gifts and blessings; comp. Heb. vii. 18, and see Grot. in loc.

πάλιν ἄνωθεν] ‘again anew,’ ‘aftra iupana,’ Goth.; not pleonastic like *πάλιν* *ἐκ δευτέρου* (Matth. xxvi. 42), *ἐπειτα μετὰ τοῦτο* (John xi. 7), but expressive of two distinct ideas, *relapse* to bondage and *recommencement* of its principles. The Galatians had been slaves to the *στοιχεῖα* in the form of heathenism; now they were desiring to enslave themselves *again* to the *στοιχεῖα*, and to *commence* them *anew* in the form of Judaism: compare ‘*rursum denuo*,’ Plaut. *Cas.* Prol. 33 (Wetst.), and see Hand, *Tur-*

sell. Vol. II. p. 279.

10. *ἡμέρας]* ‘days,’ scil. Jewish Sabbaths, fasts, &c. (comp. Rom. xiv. 5, 6, Col. ii. 16); appy. emphatic, and not improbably placed forward as marking what they observed with most scrupulosity; see Alf. in loc. It however can scarcely be considered exegetically exact to urge this verse against ‘any theory of a Christian Sabbath’ (Alf.), when the Apostle is only speaking of legal and Judaizing observances; see on Col. ii. 17.

παρατηρεῖσθε] ‘Ye are studiously observing,’ comp. *Ἄεθ. tetaqabu* [where the conjug. (III. 3, Dillm.) does not seem without its force]; the force of the compound being appy. ‘*sedulo*’ (Meyer) not ‘superstitiose observatis’ (Bretsch.),—a meaning which the passages adduced, e.g. Joseph. *Ant.* III. 5. 5, *παρατηρεῖν τὰς ἔρδουιδας*; Cod. A. *Relat. Pilat.* (Thilo, *Cod. Ap.* p. 806), *τὸ σάββατον παρατηρεῖσθαι*, do not substantiate. It may be observed that the primary use of *παρά* in this verb is appy. *local*, and by implication *intensive*, scil.—‘standing close beside for the purpose of more effectually observing’ (comp. Acts ix. 24, and see Rost u. Palm, *Lex.* s. v. Vol. II. p. 720): the secondary force is more distinctly *ethical*, but appy. restricted to the idea of *hostile observation* (Mark iii. 2, Luke vi. 7, xiv. 1); compare Polyb. *Hist.* xvii. 3. 2, *ἐνδέρειν καὶ παρατηρεῖν*, and see exx. in Schweigh. *Lex. Polyb.* s. v., and in Steph. *Thes.* s. v. Vol. VI. p. 410. The punctuation of this verse is doubtful. *Tisch.*, Mey., Alf., al., place a mark of interrogation after *ἐναντούσ*, but appy. with somewhat less contextual probability than the simple period (*Lachm.*); as in this latter case

II τηρεῖσθε καὶ μῆνας καὶ καιροὺς καὶ ἐνιαυτούς. φοβοῦμαι
ὑμᾶς, μήπως εἰκῇ κεκοπίακα εἰς ὑμᾶς.

the verse supplies a natural verification of the statement implied in the preceding question, explaining *rīs rīs δούλειας τρόπος* (Theod.), and forming a natural transition to the sadder tone of ver. II. To derive a hint merely from the use of the pres. tense that the Galatians were then celebrating a sabbatical year (Wieseler, *Chron. Apost.* p. 286 note), seems very precarious. *καιρούς* ‘seasons,’ i.e. of the festivals; compare 2 Chron. viii. 13, *τὸν ἀναφέρειν κατὰ τὰς ἔτοιάς Μωϋσῆς ἐν τοῖς σαββάτοις καὶ ἐν τοῖς μησὶ καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἑορταῖς, τρεῖς καιρούς τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ* and Lev. xxiii. 4. *ἐνιαυτούς* ‘years,—the sabbatical years, and (according to the usual explanation) the years of Jubilee. These latter, Meyer asserts, on the authority of Kranold (*de Anno Jubil.* p. 79), were never really celebrated; contrast however the direct command in Lev. xxv. 2—5, and comp. the distinct allusions to it in other places (e.g. Isa. lxi. 1, 2). Whether the year of Jubilee is here alluded to may be a matter of opinion; but that both before (opp. to Winer, *RWB.* Art. ‘Jubeljahr,’ Vol. I. p. 626) and after the captivity it was fully observed, there seems no sufficient reason to doubt; see Kitto, *Bibl. Cyclop.* Art. ‘Jubilee,’ Vol. II. p. 162.

II. φοβοῦμαι ὑμᾶς] ‘I am apprehensive of you,’ ‘res vestras mihi timorem incutiunt,’ Grot.; definite and independent statement receiving its further explanation from what follows; comp. Col. iv. 17, *βλέπε τὴν διακονίαν ... ἵνα αὐτὴν πληροῖς*, and see notes *in loc.* To regard this verse as an example of that kind of attraction where a word really belonging to the subordinate clause is made the object of

and assimilated by the principal clause (Ust.; Winer, *Gr.* § 66. 5, p. 552) does not seem grammatically exact, as in such cases the *object* of the former clause is nearly always the *subject* of the latter (Scheuerl, *Synt.* § 49. 2, p. 507), e.g. *Acts xv. 36, ἐπισκεψάμεθα τοὺς ἀδελφούς.... τῶς ἔχουν* see exx. in Winer, *l. c.*, and Kypke, *Obs. Vol. I.* p. 375. It will be best then with Lachm., Buttm., al. to place a comma after *ὑμᾶς*, and to regard *μήπως* κ.τ.λ. as a separate explanatory clause.

μήπως εἰκῇ κεκοπίακα] ‘lest haply I have (actually) laboured in vain.’ ‘μή etiam indicativum adjunctum habet, ubi rem a nobis pro verâ haberi indicare volumus.’ Herm. *Viger.* No. 270; see also Winer, *Gr.* § 56. 2, p. 446; Klotz, *Devar.* Vol. I. p. 129; and notes on ch. ii. 2. Chrysost., having appy. failed to observe this idiom, has unduly pressed *φοβοῦμαι* and *μήπως*, and implied nearly a contrary sense; οὐδέπω, φησίν, ἔξεβη τὸν μανάγιον, ἀλλ’ ἔτι τὸν χειμῶνα τοῦτο ὠδίνοντα βλέπω—contrast Theod., μεμνημένος μὲν τῶν πάνων, τὸν δὲ καρπὸν οὐχ ὄρων.

εἰς ὑμᾶς] ‘upon you,’ not ‘in vobis,’ Vulg., Clarom., Arm., but ‘propter vos,’ *Æth.*, or more exactly, ‘*in vos*, emphatica locutio,’ Beng.; comp. Rom. xvi. 6, *ἔκοπλαστεν εἰς ἡμᾶς*. The meaning of *eis* (‘looking towards,’ Donalds, *Crat.* § 170) is thus not so much simply ethical, ‘in reference to,’ and hence ‘for you’ (De W.),—this being more naturally expressed by a *dat. commodi* (*Eccl. xxiv. 34*),—as ethically-local, ‘upon you,’ Auth.; comp. Bernhardy, *Synt.* v. 10, p. 217: the Apostle’s labour was directed to the Galatians, actually reached them, and so had passed *on* to them.

Treat me now with reciprocity: you once despised me not, even in my infirmity, but ἀδελφοί, δέομαι ὑμῶν. οὐδέν με ἡδι-

the deepest reverence and warmest love.

12. γίνεσθε ὡς ἐγώ, ὅτι κάγῳ ὡς ὑμεῖς, 12
am,' affectionate appeal calling on them to treat their Apostle with reciprocity (see below), and reminding them of their former love and reverence for him. ὅτι καγὸν ὡς ὑμεῖς] 'since I have become as ye are,' dissuasive from Judaism urged on the ground of his own dereliction of it; comp. 1 Cor. ix. 20, 21. The exact sentiment conveyed by these words has received several different explanations. Of these (a) that of the Greek expositors—'I was once a zealot for Judaism as ye now are' (*ταῦτα πρότερον εἰς Ιουδαίων*, Chrys.)—is open to the objection that *ἡμην* ('fui, nec amplius sum') would have thus seemed almost a necessary insertion (Mey.); comp. Just. *ad Graec.* 5 (Wetst.), γίνεσθε ὡς ἐγώ, ὅτι κάγῳ ἡμην ὡς ὑμεῖς. Again (b) that of Bengel, Fell, al., that it is only a scriptural mode of expressing warm affection (1 Kings xxii. 4), i.e. 'love me as I love you,' is certainly not in harmony with the use of *γίνεσθε* and still less with the context, where *apprehension* (*φοβούμαι*: *ὑμᾶς*) rather than *love* is what is at present uppermost in the Apostle's thoughts. It seems best then (c) with Fritz., De W., and most modern expositors to regard the clause as urging a course of reciprocity on the part of the Galatians corresponding to that which had been pursued by the Apostle; 'become free from Judaism like me, for I, though a native Jew, have become (and am) a Gentile like you, I am *τοῦς ἀρνόμοις* ὡς *ἄνομος* (1 Cor. ix. 21) *now*, though *περισσοτέρως* *ἴηλωτής* κ.τ.λ. (ch. i. 14) *then*.' see Neand. *Planting.* Vol. I. p. 223 (Bohn), and Fritz. *Fritsch.* Opusc. p. 232 sq.,

where the passage is fully discussed. ἀδελφοί, δέομαι ὑμῶν] 'brethren, I beseech you,' earnest entreaty ('verba *περικαθῆ*', Grot.) belonging, not to what follows,—though so taken by Chrys., al., and all the ancient Vv.,—but to what *precedes*, as the *δέσης* is in the first and not the last portion. This passage is curious as one in which the best ancient and the best modern interpreters are, as happens but very rarely, in direct opposition to each other.

οὐδέν με ἡδικήσατε] 'ye injured me in nothing,' allusion to their past behaviour as a reason and motive why they should now accede to the entreaty just urged; 'ye did not injure me formerly, do not injure me now by refusing to act as I beseech you to act.' The connexion is thus, as the parallel aorists *ἡδικήσατε*, *ἐξουθενήσατε*, *ξεπεπύσατε*, seem distinctly to suggest, very close with what follows, ver. 13 and 14 (which really make up a single period) forming a sort of antithetical member (see below) to the present clause, and the aor. referring to the Apostle's first visit. The usual interpretation 'there is nothing personal between us' (δηλῶν ὅτι οὐ μάστις οὐδὲ ἔχθρας ηὐ τὰ εἰρημένα, Chrys.) is both exegetically untenable (there was no *ἔχθρα* in what he had said, but the reverse) and grammatically precarious as implying in *ἡδικήσατε* either the force of a present or perfect. The interpr. reproduced by Rettig, *Stud. u. Krit.* 1830, p. 109, 'ye have not injured me, but Christ' ('nihil me privatum lessistis,' Grot.) implies an emphasis on *με* which does not seem to exist (οὐδὲ is surely the emphatic word), and equally

13 κήσατε οἴδατε δὲ ὅτι δι' ἀσθένειαν τῆς σαρκὸς εὐηγ-
14 γελισάμην ὑμῖν τὸ πρότερον, καὶ τὸν πειρασμὸν ὑμῶν

14. *ὑμῶν*] So *Lachm.* and *Tisch.* (ed. 1) with AB(C² adds *τὸν*) D¹FGN; 17. 39. 67^{**} . . . Vulg., Clarom., Copt.; Cyr., Hieron., Aug., Ambrst.; Sedul. (*Meyer, Bagge*). *Tischendorf* (ed. 2, 7) reads *μου τὸν* with D²D³EKL; appy. great majority of mass.; Syr.-Phil. (appy. Syr., Goth.), Arm.; Chrys., Thdrt., Dam., Ecum. (*Rec.*, *Scholz*, *Fritz* om. *μου*, *Alf.*). Independently of the pre-

tends to infringe on the force of the aorist.

13. *οἴσατε δὲ*] ‘Yea ye know,’ ‘scitis potius;’ opposition, not so much of clauses (this would be *οὐκ*—*διλλά*, comp. Chrys.), as of the sentiments conveyed in the preceding clause and in the two verses which here follow; ‘when I first came among you, and that under circumstances trying to you, far from wronging me, ye received me as an angel of God.’

14. *δι' ασθένειαν τῆς σαρκός*] ‘on account of weakness of the flesh;’ i.e. on account of some sickness or bodily weakness, which caused the Apostle to stay longer with the Galatians than he had originally intended, and of which we know nothing beyond the present allusion: see, as to lexical usage, Winer, *Gr.* § 49. c, p. 356; Fritz, *Rom.* iii. 25, Vol. I. p. 197: and as to the historical probability, Wieseler, *Chron. Apost.* p. 30, and Conyb. and Hows. *St Paul*, Vol. I. p. 294 (ed. 1). Though, on the one hand, it may be admitted that the line of demarcation between *διὰ* with the gen. and with the accus. is occasionally so faint that in some few passages (esp. with *persons*) an interchange seems really to have taken place (see exx. in Steph. *Thes.* s.v. collected by Dindorf, and in Bretsch. *Lex.* s.v.)—but except Heb. v. 12, Rev. iv. 11, and appy. Rev. xii. 11); still in the present case there seems nothing so irreconcileable with the context (Peile, *Bagge*), or so im-

probable in itself, as to lead us to adopt either of the two only possible (?) alternatives, (a) an enallage of case (Ust. al.), or (b) a temporal use of *διὰ*, scil. ‘during a period of sickness.’ To the first of these there is the great objection that no certain instance has yet been adduced from the N.T., neither John vi. 57 (see Lücke *in loc.*) nor Phil. i. 15 (see notes *in loc.*) being exx. in point; and to the second, the equally valid objection that this species of temporal, or, more correctly speaking, local meaning (e.g. *διὰ νύκτα*, comp. *διὰ πόντων*, *διὰ στόμα*, &c.) is only found in poetry, and that rarely Attic; comp. Bernhardy, *Synt.* v. 18, p. 236; Madvig, *Gr.* § 69. We seem bound then to maintain the simple meaning of the words, and to refer to our ignorance of the circumstances (Green, *Gr.* p. 300) any difficulties the expression may appear to involve.

τὸ πρότερον may be translated either ‘formerly’ (Deut. ii. 12, Josh. xi. 10, Joh. vi. 62, ix. 8), or ‘the first time’ (*πρότερον*, Heb. iv. 6, vii. 27). The latter is preferable; for, as Meyer observes, the words would be superfluous if St Paul had been only once. Still no historical conclusions can safely be drawn from this expression alone; see Wieseler, *Chron. Apost.* p. 30, 277.

14. *τὸν πειρασμὸν ὑμῶν*] ‘your temptation,’ scil. ‘your trial which arose, or might reasonably have arisen, from the bodily infirmity on account of which I ministered among

ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ μου οὐκ ἔξουθενήσατε οὐδὲ ἔξεπτύσατε,
ἀλλὰ ὡς ἄγγελον Θεοῦ ἐδέξασθέ με, ὡς Χριστὸν
Ἰησοῦν. τίς οὖν ὁ μακαρισμὸς ὑμῶν; μαρτυρῶ γὰρ 15

ponderance of external authority, the change from the easier to the more difficult reading seems so *very* probable, that, in spite of the internal objections of Fritzsche (*Opusc.* p. 245 sq.), we can here scarcely hesitate to adopt the reading, though not the punctuation (see note), of Lachmann. Mill (*Append.* p. 51) retracts his former opinion, and distinctly advocates ὑμῶν.

you;’ ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ μου coalescing with, and forming an explanatory addition to the otherwise seemingly ambiguous τὸν πειρασμὸν ὑμῶν comp. 2 Cor. x. 10, ἡ δὲ παρουσία τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ· καὶ ὁ λόγος ἔξουθενῆμεν· and see Mill (*Append.* to *N. T.*), p. 51. The objection to this interpretation founded on the absence of the art. before ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ μου (Rück.) is here not valid, as πειράζειν ἐν τωι (comp. Eccl. xxvii. 5) is appy. an admissible construction; see Winer, *Gr.* § 20. 2, p. 123, and notes on *Eph.* i. 15. Lachmann places a period after μοῦ, and connects τὸν πειρασμὸν ὑμ. with ver. 13; but this does very little to remove the difficulty in the former part of this verse, and makes the latter part intolerably harsh and abrupt.

[ἔκπτύσατε]

‘loathed,’ ‘respiuistis,’ Vulg., Clarom.,
ஓ [abominati estis] Syr.: ‘plus
est ἔκπτύσεων quam ἔξουθενεν, hoc enim
contemptum, illud et abominationem
significat,’ Grot.; see Kypke, *Obser.*
Vol. II. p. 280. Of the compounds of
πτύω, those with ἐν and ἐκ are only
used in the *natural*, and not, as κατ-
απτ., διαπτ., διπτ., in the *metaphorical* sense; see Lobeck, *Phryn.* p.
15 sq. Probably, as Fritz. suggests,
ἔκπτ. was here used rather than the
more common διπτ. by a kind of
alliteration after ἔξουθενῆσατ, ‘non
reprobasti aut respiuisti,’ more esp.

as a repetition of the same prep. in composition appears to be an occasional characteristic of the Apostle’s style; comp. Rom. ii. 17, xi. 7. De Wette feels a difficulty in ἔξουθ. and ἔκπτ. being applied to πειρασμὸς on the part of the Galatians. Yet surely, whether referred to St Paul or to the Galatians, the expression is equally elliptical, and must in either case imply despising that which formed or suggested the πειρασμός.

ὡς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν] ‘(yea) as Christ Jesus;’ climactic, denoting the deep affection and veneration with which he was received; comp. 2 Cor. v. 20: the Galatians received the Apostle not only as an angel, but as One higher and more glorious (Heb. i. 4), even as Him who was the Lord of angels.

15. τίς οὖν] ‘Of what kind then?’
scil. ὦν [inserted in DEK(η FG); mss.; Chrys.]; ‘qualis (not quanta), h. e. quam levis, quam inconstans, igitur erat;’ Fritz.: sorrowful enquiry, expressive of the Apostle’s real estimate of the nature of their μακαρισμός. οὐχεῖται, διώλετο· καλῶς οὖν διφηρόμενος, ἀλλὰ δι’ ἐρωτήσεως ἐνδειξμένος. Theod.-Mops. If τοῦ be adopted, for which there is greater external authority [ABCFGN; 6 mss.; Boern., Syr., Vulg., Copt., Arm., al.; Dam., Hier., al.], but which seems to bear every appearance of having been a correction (τὸ τις διτὶ τοῦ ποιῶ τέθεικεν,

νῦν ὅτι εἰ δυνατὸν τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ὑμῶν ἔξορύζαντες
ιδέωκατε μοι. ὥστε ἔχθρὸς ὑμῶν γέγονα ἀληθεύων ὑμῖν;

Theod.), then *ἔστιν* must be supplied, and *οὐν* taken in its ‘vis *collectiva*;’ whereas in the present case what has been called the *vis reflexiva* (‘takes up what has been said and continues it,’ Donalds. *Crat.* § 192) is more apparent; see Klotz, *Devar.* Vol. II. p. 719, and notes on *Phil.* ii. 1.

μακαρισμὸς ὑμῶν] ‘the boasting of your blessedness,’ ‘beatitatis vestrae prædicatio,’ Beza; the Galatians themselves being obviously both the *μακαρίζοντες* (not St Paul and others, Ecum.; comp. Theoph.) and the *μακαριζόμενοι*: see Rom. iv. 6 (where λέγει τὸν μακαρισμὸν=μακαρίζει), and comp. Fritz. *in loc.* The word is occasionally found in earlier writers (*e.g.* Plato, *Rep.* IX. p. 591 D; Aristot. *Rhet.* I. 9. 4) and is of common occurrence in the Greek liturgies; see Suicer, *Thesaur.* s. v. Vol. II. p. 290 sq.

τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ὑμῶν] ‘your eyes,’ ‘oculos vestros,’ Vulg., Clarom.; not ‘your own eyes,’ Auth. (*τοὺς ἡδοὺς ὀφθαλμούς*), as the article and pronoun are found in the N. T. constantly associated with *ὅφθ.* where no emphasis is intended; comp. Joh. iv. 35, and see the numerous exx. in Bruder, *Concord.* s. v. p. 667. All inferences then from this passage that the *ἀσθένεια* of the Apostle was a disease of the eyes are in the highest degree precarious; see Alf. *in loc.*

ἴξορύζετε] ‘having plucked out,’ ‘eruissest et dedissest,’ Vulg., Clarom.; participle expressive of an act *immediately* prior to, and all but synchronous with, that of the finite verb; comp. Hermann, *Viger.* No. 224. That the verb *ἴξορύζετε* (‘usgraban,’ Goth.) is a ‘verbum solemne’ (Mey.) for the extirpation of the eye (*i Sam.* xi. 2, Herod. VIII. 116, &c.) may

perhaps be doubted, as *ἐκκέντειν* *ὅφθαλμὸν* is used in cases apparently similar (*Judges* xvi. 21, comp. Lucian, *Toxaris*, 40), though more generally applicable to the simple destruction of the organ: see Demosth. p. 247. § 82; Aristoph. *Nub.* 24 (*λύθη*); Plutarch, *Lycurg.* II (*βακτηρίᾳ*). The Greek vocabulary on this subject is very varied; see the numerous synonyms in Steph. *Thes.* s. v. *ὅφθαλμός*. *ἴδεσκατε*] ‘ye would have given;’ the *δὲ* [Rec. with D²EKL; mss.] being rightly omitted with greatly preponderating evidence [ABCD¹FGN; 2 mss.]; comp. John xv. 22, xix. 11. This omission of the particle has a ‘rhetorical’ force (Herm.), and differs from the past tense with *δὲ*, as marking more definitely the *certainty* that the event mentioned in the apodosis would have taken place, if the restriction expressed or implied in the protasis had not existed; see Herm. *de Partic.* *δὲ*, p. 58 sq.; Schmalfeld, *Synt.* § 79. p. 185. Whether this distinction can always be maintained in the N. T. is perhaps doubtful, as the tendency to omit *δὲ* in the apodosis (especially with the imperf.) is certainly a distinct feature of later Greek; see Winer, *Gr.* § 42. 2, p. 273, and comp. Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* s. v. Ι. I, Vol. I. p. 145.

16. *ἄστε]* ‘So then?’ ‘Ergo?’ Vulg., Clarom.; consequence (expressed interrogatively) from the present state of things as contrasted with the past,—‘so then, as things now stand, am I become your enemy?’ *οὐχ ὑμεῖς ἔστε οἱ περιέποντες καὶ θεραπεύοντες καὶ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν τιμώτεροι δύοντες;* *Tι τοινυν γέγονε;* πόθεν ἡ ἔχθρα; Chrys. The consecutive force of *ἄστε* is more strongly pressed by

Your false teachers only
court you for selfish
ends: and ye are fickle.

Zηλοῦσιν ὑμᾶς οὐ καλῶς, ἀλλὰ ἐκ-

ends: and ye are fickle. Would that I were with you, and could alter my tone.

Meyer, who accordingly connects the particle with the interrogation *τίς οὐν μακάρ.*; of which it is to be conceived as expressing the special consequence, ‘is it in consequence of the unstable nature of your μακάρ. that &c.’—but this seems to involve the necessity of regarding μαρτυρῶ γάρ κ.τ.λ. as parenthetical, and seems less in accordance with the context than the general and more abrupt reference to present circumstances; see De Wette in loc.

The use of *ώστε* with interrog. sentences is briefly noticed by Klotz, *Devar.* Vol. II. p. 776.

ἐχθρὸς ὑμῶν γέγονα] ‘am I become your enemy?’ i.e. ‘hostile to you.’

 [dominus inimicitise]

Syr. (both), ‘inimicus vobis,’ Vulg., Clarom., ‘fijands’[Feind], Goth., Copt., Eth., Arm.,—nearly all regarding *ἐχθρός* as used substantively, and *appy.* actively, as in most of the languages above cited there are forms which would have distinctly conveyed the passive meaning. This latter meaning is adopted by Mey., Alf., al., and is not only grammatically admissible (*ἐχθρός*, as the gen. shows, acting here as a substantive), but even contextually plausible, as the opposition between the former love of the Galatians and their present aversion would thus seem more fully displayed. Still as the active meaning yields a good sense, and is adopted by most of the ancient Vv., and as there is also some ground for believing that δ *ἐχθρός ἀνθρώπος* (*Clem. Recogn.* I. 70, 71, ‘ille inimicus homo’) was actually a name by which the Judaists designated the Apostle, the active meaning is to be preferred; see Hilgenf. *Clem. Recogn.* p. 78, note;

Wieseler, *Chronol.* p. 277.

δληθεύων] ‘by speaking the truth,’ scil. ‘because I speak the truth;’ οὐκ οἶδα δλλῆην αἰτιαν’ Chrys. To what period does the participle refer? Certainly not (a) to the present Epistle, as the Apostle could not now know what the effect would be (Schott); nor (b) to the *first* visit, when the state of feeling (ver. 15) was so very different,—but (c) to the *second* (Acts xvii. 23), when Judaism had probably made rapid advances; see Wieseler, *Chronol.* p. 277. No objection can be urged against this from the use of the pres. (imperf.) participle, as the action was still lasting; see Winer, *Gr.* § 45. I, p. 304; Schmalfeld, *Synt.* § 202, p. 406..

17. *[ηλοῦσιν ὑμ.]* ‘They are paying you court,’ scil. they are showing an anxious zeal in winning you over to their own party and opinions: contrast between the honest truthfulness of the Apostle towards his converts, and the interested and self-seeking court paid to them by the Judaizing teachers. For an example of a similar use of *ζηλοῦν* (‘sich eifrig um Jem. kümmern’ Rost u. Palm, *Lex.* s.v.),—here neither exclusively in its better sense (2 Cor. xi. 2), nor yet in its worse (Acts vii. 9, comp. Chrys.), but in the neutral meaning of ‘paying court to’ (‘studiose ambere,’ Fritz),—see Plut. VII. p. 762 (cited by Fritz), οὐδὲ χρειας τὸ πρῶτον ἔπονται καὶ ζηλοῦσιν, οὔτερον δὲ καὶ φιλοῦσιν.

ἀλλὰ ἐκκλεῖσαι κ.τ.λ.] ‘nay they desire to exclude you;’ they not merely follow the positive and less dishonourable course of including you among themselves [Syr. read *ἐγκλ.*, but *appy.* only from mistake], but the baser and more negative one of excluding you from others to make you thus

18 κλεῖσαι ὑμᾶς θέλουσιν, ἵνα αὐτοὺς ζηλοῦτε. καλὸν δέ

court them. The omission of a gen. after ἐκκλ. (see Kypke, *Obs.* II. 181) makes it difficult to determine the objects *from which* the false teachers sought to exclude those whom they affected, and has caused the ellipsis to be supplied in various ways; e.g. τῆς τεκέλας γνῶμεως (Chrys.), ‘a Christo et fiducia ejus’ (Luther), ‘ab aliis omnibus’ (Schott), ‘e circulis suis,’ i.e. ‘by affecting exclusiveness to make you court them’ (Koppe, comp. Brown),—the last ingenious, but all more or less arbitrary. The only clue afforded by the context is the position of *αὐτούς*, which suggests a marked personal antithesis, and the use of ἐκκλεῖσαι, which seems more naturally to refer to numbers or a community (Mey.) than to anything abstract or individual. Combining these two observations, we may perhaps with probability extend the reference from St Paul (ed. I; Fritz.) to that of the sounder portion of the Church with which he in thought associates himself, and from which he reverts back again to himself in ver. 18. The moment of thought however rests really on the *verb*, not on the objects to which it may be thought to refer. The Galatians were courted, and that *οὐ καλῶς* in every way: direct proselytizing on the part of these teachers (if they had been sincere in their convictions) might have worn a semblance of being *καλῶν*: their course however was rather (*διλλὰ*) indirect, it was to *isolate* their victims, that in their isolation they might be forced to affect those who thus dishonestly affected them. ‘Ἄλλὰ thus preserves its proper force, and becomes practically corrective; see Klotz, *Devar.* Vol. II. p. 2, 3; Hartung, *Partik.* Vol. II. p. 35. The reading

ὑμᾶς which has still some few defenders (Scholof. *Hints*, p. 96, comp. De W.) appears to have been a conjecture of Beza. Though *said* to have been since found in a few mss., the assertion of Scholz, ‘ὑμᾶς ε codd. recent. fere omnibus,’ is a complete mis-statement. [ηλοῦτε] ‘in order that ye may zealously affect them;’ purpose of the ζηλοῦσιν οὐ καλῶς, *ἴνα* not being adverbial (‘ubi, quo in statu,’ Fritz., Mey.), but the simple conjunction, associated here, as also in I Cor. iv. 6, with the indic. *per solcicium*; see Winer, *Gr.* § 41. b. I, p. 259, and Green, *Gr.* p. 73, who calls attention to the fact that both solcisms appear in a contracted verb, where they might certainly have more easily occurred. Hilgenfeld cites as a parallel Clem. *Hom.* XI. 16 (read 6), *ἴνα ὑπῆρχεν*, but the preceding clause, *εἰ θελεῖτε αὐτὸν ποιῆσαι*, seems, structurally considered, in effect equivalent to *εἰ ἐτολγησεν*, and *ὑπῆρχεν* only the imperf. ‘in re irrita vel infecta,—a usage appy. not familiar to this expositor (see p. 131, and comp. notes on ch. ii. 2), but perfectly regular and idiomatic; see Madvig, *Synt.* § 131; Schmalfeld, *Synt.* § 143, p. 294. It may be remarked that the MSS. and mss. (113, 219^{**} [ζηλῶτε], only excepted) are unanimous in the indic., and that all the ancient Vv. appear to have regarded *ἴνα* as a conjunction.

18. καλὸν δὲ τὸ [ηλοῦσθαι κ.τ.λ.] ‘But it is good to be courted in a good way at all times;’ contrasted statement of what it is to be courted in a good and lasting manner. There is some little obscurity in this verse owing to the studied and characteristic παρονομασία (comp. Winer, *Gr.* § 68. I, p. 560) which marks the terms in which it is expressed. As the expla-

τὸ ζηλοῦσθαι ἐν καλῷ πάντοτε, καὶ μὴ μόνον ἐν τῷ παρεῖναι με πρὸς ὑμᾶς. τεκνία μου, οὓς πάλιν ὠδίνω 19

nations of the verse are somewhat varied, we may perhaps advantageously premise the following limitations : (1) All interpretations which do not preserve one uniform meaning of *ζῆλος* in both verses (*e. g.* Rück., and even De W. and Fritz.) may be rejected : from which it would seem to follow that *ἐν καλῷ* does not point to the sphere of the *ζῆλοῦσθαι*, in the sense of the virtues which called out the feeling (*ἐπὶ τῷ τελεύτῃ*, Theoph., comp. De W.),—as this would practically cause *ζῆλον* to pass from its neutral meaning ‘ambire’ to the more restricted ‘admirari,’—but is to be regarded as simply adverbial (comp. Bernhardy, *Synt.* v. 8. b, p. 211), and perhaps as varied only from the preceding *καλῶς* to harmonize structurally with the following *ἐν τῷ παρεῖναι*. (2) *Ζῆλοῦσθαι* must be regarded as pass. (comp. Syr.), not as a middle equiv. in sense to active (Vulg., Clarom., Goth.), as no evidence of such a use of *ζῆλοῦσθαι* has yet been found; (3) the object of *ζῆλοῦσθαι* must be the *Galatians*, as in ver. 17, and not (Ust.) St Paul: (4) *ἐν τῷ παρεῖναι* is not to be translated *prospectively* (Peile), but must mean simply, ‘when I am with you.’ Thus narrowed then, the meaning would seem to be, ‘But it is a good thing to be the object of *ζῆλος*, to be courted, in an honest way (as you are by me, though not by them) at all times, and not merely just when I happen to be with you.’ Thus *ζῆλοῦσθαι* *ἐν καλῷ* forms as it were a compound idea = *ζῆλοῦσθαι καλῶς* (Peile), and is in strict antithesis to the act. *ζῆλος καλῶς* in the preceding verse; see Wieseler, *Chron. Apost.* p. 278. πρὸς ὑμᾶς] ‘with you,’ the primary idea of direction is

frequently lost sight of, especially with persons; comp. John i. 1, Thess. iii. 4, 2 Thess. ii. 5, and see notes on ch. i. 18.

19. *τεκνία μου*] ‘*My little children;*’ appropriate introduction to the tender and affectionate address which follows. Usteri, Scholz, Lachmann, and other expositors and editors connect these two words with ver. 18, putting a comma only after *ὑμᾶς*. By such a punctuation (suggested probably by a difficulty felt in the idiomatic δέ, ver. 20) the whole effect of the present address is lost, and the calm and semi-proverbial comment of ver. 18, to which it now forms such a sudden and tender contrast, is weakened by the addition of an incongruous appeal. The appropriate and affectionate *τεκνία* (only here in St Paul, but often in St John) is changed by Lachm. into *τέκνα* [with BFGN], but rightly retained by the majority of recent editors.

ἔδίνει] ‘*I am in travail;*’ not ‘in utero gesto’ (Heinsius, *Exerc.* p. 424, comp. Alf.),—a meaning for which there is no satisfactory authority in the N. T. or the LXX, but simply ‘parturio,’ Vulg., Clarom., 

[sum parturiens] Syr., with the idea not so much of the pain, as of the long and continuous effort of travail: see exx. in Loesner, *Obs.* p. 333, and observe the tender touch in the *τελευτής*, scil. *ἄστε τῶν πατακῶν ὀδίνων ἀγαγεῖν εἰς μνήμην*. The use of *ὀδίνων* in eccl. writers is illustrated by Suicer, *Thes.* Vol. II. p. 1595. δχρις οὐ πορφεθῆ] ‘until Christ be formed,’ ‘until the new man, Christ in us (oh. ii. 20, comp. Eph. iii. 17), receive as I doubt not he will (ἢ perhaps designedly omitted; see ch. iii. 19, and

20 ἄχρις οὗ μορφωθῇ Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν, ἥθελον δὲ παρεῖναι πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἄρτι καὶ ἀλλάξαι τὴν φωνὴν μου, ὅτι ἀποροῦμαι ἐν ὑμῖν.

Herm. *de Partic.* *dw.*, p. 40), his completed and proper form; the obvious meaning of this word (*ἴξεικοιτέσθαι*, *εἰδοτοιτέσθαι*, see Heinsius, *Exerc.* p. 424) seeming to show that the metaphor is continued, though in a changed application. The doctrinal meaning of *μορφ.* is alluded to by Ust. *Lehrb.* II. I. 3, p. 225 sq., but see esp. Waterland, *on Regen.* Vol. IV. 445, who satisfactorily shows that this passage cannot be urged in favour of a *second* regeneration. On the meaning of *ἄχρι* and its distinction from *μέχρι*, see notes on *2 Tim.* ii. 9.

20. [ἥθελον δὲ] ‘I could indeed wish,’ imperf. without *dw.*, comp. *Rom.* ix. 3, *Acts* xxv. 22. In all such cases the simple imperf., which here appears in the true distinctive character of the tense (Bernh. *Synt.* x. 3, 373), must be referred to a suppressed conditional clause, *vellem* sc. *si possem*, *si liceret* (Fritz. *Rom.* ix. 3, Vol. II. p. 245), but must be distinguished from the imperf. with *dw.*, which involves a thought (‘but I will not’) which is here not intended: see Herm. *de Partic.* *dw.*, p. 56; Winer, *Gr.* § 41. 2, p. 253. The distinction drawn by Schömann (*Iscus.* x. 1, p. 435, cited by Win.) between *ἥθελον* or *ἔθελμην* with *dw.* (‘significat voluntatem a conditione suspensam, sc. *vellem*, *si liceret*’) and without *dw.* (‘vere nec illud voluisse, etiam *si omittenda fuerit voluntas, scilicet, quod frustra nos velle cognovimus,*’—in such cases often with a preparatory *μὲν*) is subtle, but appy. of limited application, even in earlier Greek: in later Greek it is still more precarious; see notes on ver. 15. The omission of *dw.* in cases of ‘objective necessity’ is well treated by Stallbaum

on Plato, *Sypos.* p. 190 c, p. 130. *δὲ* has caused some difficulty to be felt in the connexion. Scholef. (*Hints*, p. 77) proposes to regard *δὲ* as redundant; Hilgenfeld commences with *ἥθελον δὲ* a new clause, leaving ver. 20 an unfinished address. This is not necessary; the present use of *δὲ* is analogous to its use with personal pronouns after vocatives or in answers (Bernhardy, *Synt.* III. 5, p. 73; Pors. *Orest.* 614), the principle of explanation being the same, ‘adseveratio non sine oppositione;’ see Klotz, *Devar.* Vol. II. p. 365 sq. This ‘opposition’ Meyer traces in the tacit contrast between the subject of his wish, to be present with them, and his actual absence and separation.

ἄρτι] ‘now;’

see notes on ch. i. 9.
ἀλλάξαι τὴν φωνὴν μου] ‘to change my voice,’ soil to a milder, not necessarily to a more mournful (Chrys.), still less to a more severe tone (Michael.), which would be wholly at variance with the preceding affectionate address. There does not however appear any historical allusion to the tone which the Apostle used at his last visit (Wieseler, *Chron. Apost.* p. 280, note), but only to the severity of tone adopted generally in this epistle. The peculiar meanings of *ἀλλάξαι* adopted by Theodoret (*τῶν μὲν τὴν ἔκτροτὴν θρηῆσαι τῶν δὲ τὸ βέβαιον θαυμάσαι*; comp. also Theod.-Mops.), Greg.-Nysa. (*μελλων μετατίθεναι τὴν λοτοπλανταὶ τροπικὴν θεωρίαν*), Grotius (‘modo asperius modo lenius loqui’), Whithby (‘temper my voice’), al.—seem all artificial, and are certainly not confirmed by the two exx. cited by Wetst., viz. Artemidor. II. 20, and Dio Chrys. 59, p. 575, in both of which

Ye understand not the deeper meanings of the law, as the allegory of Abraham's two sons, the one typical of the earthly, the other of the heavenly Jerusalem, will fully prove.

there are qualifications which render the meaning more apparent.

The change of tense παρένται, δλλδξαι, must not be overpressed (Peile), such a change being only due to the essential difference of meaning between the two verbs, and even in the case of other verbs being far from uncommon; see Jelf, *Gr.* § 401. 5; Winer, *Gr.* § 40. 2, p. 238. *δποροῦμαι*] 'I

am perplexed,' Arm., Ա Շ Ո Յ Ո Հ [obstupesco] Syr., *dπop.* being a pass. in a *deponent* sense; comp. John xiii. 22, Acts xxv. 20, 2 Cor. iv. 8. Fritzsche (*Opusc.* p. 257) still adopts the pure pass. sense, 'nam in vestro oœtu de me trepidatur, i.e. sum vobis suspectus' (comp. Vulg., Clarom., 'confundor'), but this is at variance with the regular use of the verb in the N. T., and ill harmonizes with the wish which the Apostle has just expressed. He feels *perplexed* as to how he shall bring back the Galatians to the true faith; by δληθεύω he had called out their aversion, perhaps a change of tone might work some good. *ἐν ὑμῖν*] 'in you,' scil. 'about you,' *ἐν*, as usual, marking as it were the sphere in which, or substratum on which, the action takes place; see Winer, *Gr.* § 48. a, p. 345, and compare 2 Cor. vii. 16, θαρρῶ *ἐν ὑμῖν*. Other constructions of *dπop.* are found in the N. T., e. g. with *περι*, John xiii. 22, and with *εἰς*, Acts xxv. 20.

21. λέγετε μοι κ.τ.λ.] Illustration of the real difference between the law and the promise as typified in the history of the two sons of Abraham; see notes on ver. 24.

Θέλοντες] 'are willing, desirous;' not

Λέγετέ μοι, οἱ ὑπὸ νόμου θέλοντες 21
εἶναι, τὸν νόμον οὐκ ἀκούετε; γέγρα- 22
πται γάρ ὅτι Ἀβραὰμ δύο νιοὺς ἔσχεν,

without emphasis and significance; οὐ γάρ τῆς τῶν πραγμάτων ἀκολούθις, δλλὰ τῆς ἐκείνων ἀκάρον φιλονεκίας τὸ πρᾶγμα ἦν Chrys. τὸν νόμον οὐκ δκ.] 'do ye not hear the law?' 'do ye not give ear to what it really says?' Various shades of meaning have been given to this verb. Usteri and Meyer retain the simplest meaning, with ref. to the custom of reading in the synagogues (Luke iv. 16),—an interpr. to a certain degree countenanced by the ancient gloss *διαγινώσκετε* [DEFG; 3 miss.; Vulg., Clarom., al.]. As however (1) it is fairly probable that the law was not as *commonly* read in Christian communities as in the Jewish; —Justin Mart. *Apol.* I. p. 83, mentions only τὰ διαμημορέψατα τῶν διαστόλων, ή τὰ συγγράμματα τῶν προφητῶν but this must not be *pressed*, as the earliest congregations probably to some extent adopted the practice of the synagogue; see Bingham, *Antiq.* XIII. 4:—and (2) as of θέλοντες refers rather to persons Judaically inclined than confirmed Judaists; the meaning 'give ear to' (scarcely so much as 'attento animo percipere,' Schott) seems most suitable in the present case; comp. Matth. x. 14, Luke xvi. 29, 31.

22. γέγραπται γάρ] 'For it is written,' explanatory proof from the law of the justice of the negation involved in the foregoing question. The particle γάρ has here the mixed argumentative and explanatory force in which it is so often found in these Epp., and approaches somewhat in meaning to the more definite *profecto*: see Hartung, *Partik. γάρ*, 2. 2, Vol. I. p. 464 sq.; Klotz, *Devar.* Vol. II. p.

23 ἔνα ἐκ τῆς παιδίσκης καὶ ἔνα ἐκ τῆς ἐλευθέρας. ἀλλ᾽
οὐ μὲν ἐκ τῆς παιδίσκης κατὰ σάρκα γεγένηται, οὐ δέ
24 ἐκ τῆς ἐλευθέρας διὰ τῆς ἐπαγγελίας. ἄτινά ἔστιν

234 sq.; and comp. Hand, *Turcell.* Vol. II. p. 376. The Apostle *explains* by the citation the meaning of his question, while at the same time he slightly *proves* the justice of putting it; see notes on *1 Thess. ii. 1.*

τῆς παιδίσκης] ‘the bond-maid,’ the well-known one, Hagar. The word is not always used in this restricted sense; see Lobeck, *Phryn.* p. 239.

23. δλλά] ‘*Hovbeit*’ The full force of this particle may be felt in the statement of the complete opposition of character and nature between the two sons which it introduces; ‘Abraham had two sons; though sprung from a common father, they were *notwithstanding* of essentially different characters.’ On the force of this particle, see the good article by Klotz, *Devar.* Vol. II. p. 1 sq.

καρδ σάρκα] ‘according to the flesh,’ scil. ‘after the regular course of nature,’ Bloomf., καρδ φύσεως ἀκόλουθα, Chrys.; not perhaps without some idea of imperfection, weakness, &c. and, as the next clause seems to hint, some degree of latent opposition to πνεῦμα: see Müller, *Doctr. of Sin,* Vol. I. p. 355 (Clark); Tholuck, *Stud. u. Krit.* for 1855, p. 487; and comp. notes on ch. iii. 3.

8α τῆς ἐπαγγελίας] ‘by means of, by virtue of (Hamm.) the promise,’ not ‘under the promise’ (Peile); the prep. here marking not merely the ‘condition,’ ‘circumstances’ (δι’ ὑπομονῆς, Rom. viii. 25), but, as Usteri justly remarks, denoting the *causa medians* of the birth of Isaac. Through the might and by virtue of the promise (see Gen. xviii. 10) Sarah conceived Isaac, even as the Virgin conceived our Lord through

the divine influence imparted at the Annunciation; see Chrys. *in loc.*, who however reads καὶ ἐπαγγελίαν.

24. ἀτινά] ‘All which things viewed in their most general light;’ Col. ii. 23, ἀτινά ἔστιν λόγον μὲν ἔχοντα. It is very doubtful whether Usteri is correct in maintaining that ἀτινά is here simply equivalent to ἀ. The difference between δ and δτις may not be always *very* distinctly marked in the N. T., but there are certainly grounds for asserting that in very many of the cases where δτις appears used for δ it will be found to be used either,—(1) *Indefinitely*, i.e. where the antecedent is more or less indefinite, either (a) in its own nature, from involving some general notion (Pape, *Lex.* s. v. δτις, 2), or (b) from the way the subject is presented to the reader; e.g. Phil. i. 28 (where the subject is really a portion of a sentence), Col. ii. 23, al.: in such cases the relative frequently agrees with the consequent, see exx. in Winer, *Gr.* § 24. 3, p. 150: the present passage appears to fall under this head, as the subject is not merely the facts of the birth of the two sons, but all the circumstances viewed generally:—(2) *Classificatory*, i.e. where the subject is represented as one of a class or category, e.g. ch. ii. 4, 1 Cor. iii. 17 (see Mey. *in loc.*); comp. Matth. *Gr.* § 483; Jelf, *Gr.* § 816. 4:—(3) *Explicatively*, e.g. Eph. i. 23 (see Harless *in loc.*); not merely in a causal sense, as is commonly asserted; see Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* s. v. 3, Vol. II. p. 385, comp. Herm. (*Ed. Rex*, 688 (714)):—or lastly (4) *Differentially*, i.e. where it denotes an attribute which essentially belongs to the nature of

ἀλληγορούμενα· αὗται γάρ εἰσιν δύο διαθῆκαι, μία μὲν ἀπὸ ὅρους Σινᾶ, εἰς δουλείαν γεννῶσα, ἡτις ἐστὶν Ἡγαρ.

the antecedent; comp. 1 Cor. v. 1; see Jelf, *Gr.* § 816. 5, and Krüger, *Sprachl.* § 51. 8. 1 sq.

Great difference of opinion however still exists among scholars upon this subject. After the instances cited by Struve (who has said all that can be said in favour of an occasional equivalence), *Quæst. Herod.* I, p. 2 sq., it seems best to adopt the opinion of Ellendt, *l. c.*, that though the equivalence of *ὅτι* and *ὅτε* has been far too generally applied, there are still a few instances even in classical Greek. In later Greek this permutation took place more often, see Rost u. Palm, *Lex.* s. v. π. Bb. 2, Vol. II. p. 547; still it must never be admitted unless none of the above distinctions can fairly be applied.

ἐστιν διληγορούμενα] ‘are allegorized,’ ‘are allegorical,’ ‘by the which things another thing is meant,’ Genev.-Transl.; *ἔτρεψ μὲν λεγόμενα, ἔτρεψ δὲ νοοῦμενα*, Schol. ap. Matth.; *διληγόμενα ἐκάλεσε τὴν ἐκ παραβολῶν τῶν ἡδη γεγονότων πρὸς τὰ παρόντα σύγκρισιν* Theod.-Mops. As the simple meaning of the word in this passage has been somewhat obscured by exegetical glosses, it may be observed that *διληγορέιν* properly means to ‘express or explain one thing under the image of another’ (comp. Plutarch, *de Isid. et Osir.* § 32, p. 363, ‘Ἐλλῆνες Κρόνον διληγοροῦσι τὸν χρόνον’), and hence in the pass., ‘to be so expressed or explained;’ comp. Clem. Alex. *Strom.* V. 11, p. 687, *διληγορεῖσθαι τινα ἐκ τῶν ὄντων διώτερον*; ib. *Protrepē* II, p. 86, *δῆθις διληγορεῖται θεοντὶ ἐπὶ γαστέρα ἔποντα*. Porphyr. *Vit. Pythag.* p. 185 (Cantabr. 1655), where *διληγορεῖσθαι* is in antithesis to *κουροληγεῖσθαι*: see exx. in Wetst. in

loc. and in Kypke, *Obs.* Vol. II. p. 282. The explanation of Chrys. is thus perfectly clear and satisfactory; οὐ τούτῳ δὲ μόνῳ (ἢ λογοπά) παραδηλοῦ διπερ φάνεται, δλλὰ καὶ δλλὰ τινὰ διαγορεύει. The remarks made above, ch. iii. 16, apply here with equal force to the late attempts of several modern expositors (e.g. Meyer, De Wette, Jowett) to represent this as a *subjective*, i.e. to speak plainly, an erroneous interpretation of St Paul arising from his rabbinical education. It would be well for such writers to remember that St Paul is here declaring, under the influence of the Holy Spirit, that the passage he has cited has a second and a deeper meaning than it appears to have: that it has that meaning then is a positive, objective, and indisputable truth: see Olshausen’s note in *loc.*; Hofmann, *Schriftb.* Vol. II. 2, p. 59; and the sound remarks of Waterland (*Pref. to Script.* Vol. IV. p. 159) on the general nature of an allegory.

ἄντραι] ‘these women;’ *τῶν παιδῶν ἑκείνων αἱ μητέρες ἡ Σάρρα καὶ ἡ Ἡγαρ*. Chrys. The insertion of the art. before *δύο* (*Rec.*) is opposed to the authority of all the uncial MSS. except N, and is rejected by nearly all modern editors.

μίᾳ μὲν κ.τ.λ.] ‘one indeed from Mount Sinai’ scil. originating from, taking its rise from; δρό, with its usual local force, marking the place or centre (Alf.) whence the διαθήκη emanated; comp. Krüger, *Sprachl.* § 68. 16. 5. The *μὲν* has here no strictly correlative δέ, as that in ver. 26 refers to *τῇ μὲν Ἱερουσ.* in the verse immediately preceding; comp. Winer, *Gr.* § 63. 2. e, p. 508. *δε δουλείαν γεννῶσα*] ‘bearing children unto bondage,’ i.e. to pass under and to inherit the lot of bondage;

25 τὸ γὰρ Ἀγαρ Σινᾶ ὅρος ἐστὶν ἐν τῇ Ἀραβίᾳ· συν-

25. τὸ γὰρ Ἀγαρ Σινᾶ ὅρος] The reading adopted by *Lachm.* viz. τὸ γὰρ Σινᾶ with CFGN; 17; Aug., Boern., Vulg., *Æth.*, *Arm.*; Cyr., Epiph., Dam.; Orig. (interpr.), Hieron., al. (*Ust.*, *De W.*, *Griesb.* ‘forsitan’; see *Hofm. Schrifib.* Vol. II. 2, p. 62) is plausible and gives a very satisfactory sense. Still *Tisch.* ed. 2, 7 (see *Mill*, *Mey.*, *Scholz*), appears to have rightly returned to the *Text. Rec.*, as the juxtaposition of γὰρ and Ἀγαρ would render (on paradigmatic considerations, Pref. p. xxii) the omission of the latter word very probable. The conversion of the former into δὲ [*Tisch.* ed. 1 with ABDE; 37. 73. 80, Copt. (Wilk., not Bött.), Cyr. 1.] was perhaps suggested by the μὲν in ver. 24.

δούλη ἦν [Ἀγαρ] καὶ εἰς δουλεῖαν ἐγέννα· Θεοφ. οὗτος ἐστὶν Ἀγαρ] ‘and this is Hagar.’ The use of δούλη here seems to fall under (4): it is this covenant peculiarly, this one of which the *differentia* is that it originates from Sinai, which is allegorically identical with Hagar; see above, and esp. Jelf, *Gr.* § 816. 4.

25. τὸ γὰρ Ἀγαρ κ.τ.λ.] ‘For the word Hagar is mount Sinai in Arabia,’ i.e. among the Arabians; τὸ δὲ Σινᾶ ὅρος οὐτω μεθερμηνεύεται τῇ ἐπιχωρῷ αὐτῶν γλώττῃ Chrys.: etymological reason, added almost parenthetically, for the foregoing statement of the allegorical identity of Mount Sinai and Hagar, τὸ not agreeing with Ἀγαρ but referring to it in its abstract form (Jelf, *Gr.* § 457. 1), and ἐν τῇ Ἀραβίᾳ not supplying a mere topographical statement (comp. Syr., Copt.), but serving to define the people by whom Sinai was so called; τοῦτο τῇ τῷ Ἀράβων γλώσσῃ Ἀγαρ καλεῖται’ Schol. ap. Matth.

It is thus obvious that this interpretation presupposes that Ἀγαρ was a provincial name of the mountain. Nor does this seem at all improbable; though we are bound to say that the corroborative evidence from the modern appellations of the mountain is less strong than the appeals to it (Bloomf.; Forster, *Geogr. of Arabia*,

Vol. I. p. 182) would seem to imply. The best authority for the assertion seems to be the careful and diligent Bötsching (*Erdbechr.* Vol. V. p. 535), who adduces the statement of Harant that Sinai was still called ‘Hadschar’ in his time (‘Hadsch heißt bekanntlich auch Fels.’ Ritter, *Erdkunde*, Vol. XVI. Part I. p. 1086), though now it is commonly called either ‘Dschebel Musa’ (in a more limited reference), or ‘Dschebel et Tûr.’ see Ritter, *Erdk.* Vol. XIV. Part I. p. 535; Martiniere, *Dict. Geogr. et Crit.* s.v. ‘Sinai.’ It must also be said that the evidence from etymology also is not very strong, as the Arabian word ‘Hadjar’ (comp. Chald. حجر Gen. xxxi. 47), appears certainly only to mean ‘a stone’ (see Freytag, *Lex. Arab.* s.v. Vol. I. p. 346), still,—even if we leave unnoticed the fact of there having been a town called ‘Aṣ-ṣaṭṭār in the vicinity (Ewald; comp. Assemann, *Bibl. Orient.* Vol. III. 2, p. 753),—there are so many analogous instances of mountains bearing names in which the word ‘stone’ is incorporated (e.g. ‘Weissenstein,’ al.), that there seems nothing unnatural in supposing that Ἀγαρ actually was, and possibly may be now, the strictly *provincial* name of the portion of the mountain now commonly called ‘Dschebel Musa.’ This St Paul might have learnt during

στοιχεῖ δὲ τῇ νῦν Ἱερουσαλήμ, δουλεύει γάρ μετὰ τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς. ἡ δὲ ἦν Ἱερουσαλήμ ἐλευθέρα ἔστιν, 26

his stay in that country. It must be admitted that we escape all this if we adopt the reading of *Lachmann*: τὸ γὰρ Σινᾶ... Ἀραβίᾳ will then form a parenthesis, and the emphasis will rest on ἐν τῇ Ἀραβίᾳ. ‘For Mount Sinai is in Arabia,’—Arabia, the home of the bond-maid’s children, the *vul* “Ἄγαρ, Baruch iii. 23; comp. Hofmann, *Schriftb.* Vol. II. 2. p. 61. In this case also διαθήκη is the subject of συνστοιχεῖ (opp. to Hofm.), without the grammatical distortion in making Hagar the subject. Still there is a difficulty in the covenant being said συνστοιχεῖν as δουλεία (δουλεύει γάρ) is plainly the *tertium comparationis* between Hagar and Jerusalem, and the assertion ἡτοι ἐστὶν “Ἄγαρ is really not so much supported by the sentence which follows, as by the emphasis which is assumed to rest on ἐν τῇ Ἀραβ., the last words of it. We have therefore nothing better to offer than the former interpretation.

συνστοιχεῖ δὲ] ‘she stands too in the same file or rank with,’ is conformable with, —the nominative obviously being “Ἄγαρ (‘quæ consonat,’ Claram.,) not Σινᾶ δρός (Vulg.), nor even μια διαθήκη (De W.), as there would thus be no point of comparison (δουλεία) between the subject of συνστοιχεῖ and ἡ νῦν Ἱερουσ. (Mey.); see above. The δὲ (‘und zwar,’ Hilgenf.) appears to add a fresh explanatory characteristic, and retains its proper force in the latent contrast that the addition of a new fact brings with it; see Klotz, *Devar.* Vol. II. p. 362. Συνστοιχεῖ is best illustrated by Polyb. *Hist.* x. 21 (cited by Wetst.), συνγενῆτας καὶ συντοιχεῖτας διαμέρειν where συγγενῆ evidently refers to soldiers in the same rank,

συνστοιχ. to soldiers in the same *file*: see Fell in loc., where the two lists are drawn out; each name in which συνστοιχεῖ with those in the same list, but διαστοιχεῖ with those in the opposite list. The geographical gloss of Chrys. γειτνίζει, διπλεῖται (‘qui conjunctus est,’ Vulg., ‘gamarke’ [comp. ‘marge’] Goth.), due probably to the assumption that Σινᾶ δρός is the nom. to συνστοιχεῖ, is not exegetically tenable, and has been rejected by nearly all modern expositors.

τῇ νῦν Ἱερ.] ‘the present Jerusalem,’ scil. τῇ ἑραῳδίᾳ, τῇ ἐπὶ γῆς, Schol. ap. Matth.: ‘antitheatron superna; nunc temporis est, supra loci;’ Bengel. δουλεύει γάρ] ‘for she is in bondage,’ scil. ταῦς νομικὰς παραγρήσεσιν, Schol. ap. Matth.; comp. Hofmann, *Schriftb.* Vol. II. 2, p. 61; the nom. being ἡ νῦν Ἱερ., and the γάρ serving to confirm the justice of the assertion of συνστοιχία. The reading δὲ [Rec. with D³EKL; al.; Syr.-Phil. (marg.), al.; Ff.] is rightly rejected by most recent editors with preponderant external evidence, viz. ABCD¹FGN; many mss. and Vv.

26. ἡ δὲ ἦν Ἱερουσαλήμ] ‘But the Jerusalem above,’ contrast to the ἡ νῦν Ἱερ. of the preceding verse: the correspondence of Sarah, i.e. the other covenant, with the heavenly Jerusalem is assumed as sufficiently obvious from the context. The meaning of δὲ can scarcely be considered doubtful. It cannot be *local* (Mount Sion, ἡ δὲ πόλις, Elster, al.), as this is inconsistent with the foregoing νῦν, nor yet *temporal* (‘the ancient Jerus., the Salem of Melchizedek,’ Michael., al.), as such a ref. is inconsistent with a context which only points to later

27 ἡτις ἐστὶν μήτηρ ἡμῶν. γέγραπται γάρ, Εὐφράνθητι στεῖρα ἡ οὐ τίκτουσα, ρῆξον καὶ βόγον ἡ οὐκ ὠδίνουσα, ὅτι πολλὰ τὰ τέκνα τῆς ἐρήμου μᾶλλον ἢ τῆς ἔχουσης

periods,—but has simply its usual ethical reference, ‘above,’ ‘heavenly,’ ‘quæ sursum est,’ Vulg., Clarom.,

Առաջնորդութիւն, Syr.-Phil.; comp. ‘Ιερουσα-

λῆμ ἐπουράνιος, Heb. xii. 22, ‘Ιερουσ. κατηή, Rev. iii. 12, xxi. 2; see the rabbinical quotations in Wetst., and comp. Ust. Lehrb. II. I. 2, p. 182. As Jerusalem ἡ πόλις was the centre of Judaism and the ancient theocratic kingdom, so Jerusalem ἡ ἀνάστασις is the typical representation of Christianity and the Messianic kingdom.

On the threefold meaning of ‘Ιερουσαλήμ in the N. T. (scil. the heavenly community of the righteous, the Church on earth, the new Jerus. on the glorified earth), and the distinction observed by St John between ‘Ιερουσαλήμ (the sacred name) and ‘Ιεροσόλυμα, see Hengstenb. on Apocal. Vol. II. p. 319 (Clark); and on the general use and meaning of the expression, the learned treatise of Schoettgen, Horae Hebr. Vol. I. p. 1205—1248.

ἡτις κ.τ.λ.] ‘and this one (this δῶμα ‘Ιερουσ.) is our mother,’ ἡτις being used appy., as in ver. 24, in its ‘differential’ sense (see notes on ver. 24) and retaining the emphasis, which, as the order of the words seems to imply, does not rest on ἡμῶν (Winer).

The addition of τὸν πατέρα before ἡμῶν (Rec., [Lachm.], with AC³KLN⁴; mss.; Arab.-Pol., al.) is rightly rejected by Tisch., al., with BC¹DEFGN¹; 5 mss., and majority of Vv. and Ff.

27. γέγραπται γάρ] ‘For it is written;’ proof of the clause immediately preceding, ἡτις κ.τ.λ., from the prophetic consolation of Isaiah (ch. liv. 1), which though esp. addressed pri-

marily to Israel and Jerusalem (Knobel, Jes. p. 380), was directed with a further and fuller reference to the Church of which they were the types. ρῆξον] ‘break forth (into a cry).’ The ellipsis is usually supplied by φωνὴν, see Rost u. Palm, s.v. ρῆξην, and the numerous examples of ρῆξον φωνὴν cited by Wetst. in loc. The critical accuracy of Schott leads him to supply εὐφράνθητην (Isaiah xlix. 13, iii. 9), reverting to εὐφράνθητη, on the principle that the ellipsis is always to be supplied from the context; compare ‘erumpere gaudium,’ Terent. Eun. III. 5. 2. It is perhaps more simple to supply βοήν, derived from βοήσων with which ρῆξον is so closely joined; or still more probably, to regard ρῆξον as understood from long usage to be simply equivalent to κράξον’ ρῆξαρο, κράξατο. Hesych. ὅτι πολλὰ...μᾶλλον κ.τ.λ.] ‘for many are the children of the desolate more than of her that hath the husband,’ ‘multi filii desertæ magis quam &c.’ Vulg., Clarom., Goth.; πολλὰ μᾶλλον being not simply equivalent to τλεῖσθαι ἢ, but implying that both should have many, but the desolate one more than the other (Mey.). The compound expression τῆς ἔχουσης τὸν ἀνδρα answers to the simpler **Առաջնորդութիւն**, Syr.;

sim. **Առաջնորդութիւն**, Arm.) in the original, and is thus little more than ‘the married one,’ the force of the art. (τὸν ἀνδρα) being perhaps, as Alf. observes, too delicate to be expressed in English.

This prophecy is somewhat differently applied by Clem. Cor. II. 2, and Orig. in Rom. vi. Vol. II. p. 33 (ed. Lomm.); η στεῖρα being

τὸν ἄνδρα. ὑμεῖς δέ, ἀδελφοί, κατὰ Ἰσαὰκ ἐπαγγελίας 28
τέκνα ἔστε. ἀλλ' ὥσπερ τότε ὁ κατὰ σάρκα γεννηθεὶς 29
ἐδίωκεν τὸν κατὰ Πνεῦμα, οὗτος καὶ νῦν. ἀλλὰ τι λέγει 30

referred more peculiarly to the Gentile church as opposed to the Jewish church (*τῶν δοκούντων ἔχειν Θεόν*); whereas St Paul understands under the image of Sarah (*μήτηρ ἡμῶν*) the church as composed both of Jews and *Gentiles*, and thus as standing in contradistinction to the children of the law, the bond-children of the ancient theocracy.

28. ὅμετος δέ] ‘But ye;’ application of the foregoing allegory to the case of those whom the Apostle is now addressing; the δέ being here μεταβατικόν (Hartung, *Partik.* δέ, 2. 3, Vol. I. p. 165, see notes on ch. i. 11), and marking a *transition* to the readers while also hinting at their contrast to the children of *τῆς ἔχουσσης τὸν ἄνδρα*. If the reading of *Rec.* ἡμ...ἔσμεν be adopted, which however, though well supported [ACD³EKLN; mss.; Aug., Syr., Vulg., Copt., Goth., Æth.-Platt., Arm.; Chrys., Theod., Theodrit., al.], is opposed to good external evidence [BD¹FG; 4 mss.; Claram., Sah., Æth.-Pol.; Orig., Iren.; Ambr., Ambrst., al.], and is suspicious as appy. being a conformation to ver. 31; then δέ must be considered as indicating a *resumption* of ver. 26, after the parenthetical quotation in ver. 27: see Klotz, *Devar.* Vol. II. p. 377; Hartung, *Partik.* δέ, 3. 1, Vol. I. p. 173. κατὰ Ἰσαὰκ] ‘after the example of Isaac,’ κατὰ pointing to the ‘norma’ or example which was furnished by Isaac; so 1 Pet. i. 15, κατὰ τὸν καλέσαντα Eph. iv. 24, Col. iii. 10: see Winer, *Gr.* § 49. d, p. 358. Several exx. of this usage are cited by Kypke, *Obs.* Vol. II. 284, and Wetst. *in loc.*

ἴκαγγελίας τέκνα] ‘children of pro-

mise.’ These words admit of three interpretations;—(a) ‘children who have God’s promise;’ or (b) ‘children promised by God,’ i.e. the seed promised by God to Abraham; or (c) ‘children of, i.e. by virtue of, promise.’ Both the emphasis, which appears from the order to rest on ἴκαγγ., and the words διὰ τῆς ἴκαγγ., ver. 23, seem decisively in favour of the last interpretation; comp. Rom. ix. 8, and see Fritz. *in loc.*

29. δλλά ἔστερ] ‘Howbeit as,’ special notice of an instructive and suggestive comparison between the circumstances of the types and of the antitypes, δλλά with its usual adversative force directing the reader’s attention to a fresh statement, which involves a species of contrast to the former; ‘ye are children of promise it is true, *howbeit* ye must expect persecution:’ see esp. Chrys. *in loc.*, and comp. Klotz, *Devar.* Vol. II. p. 29. ἔδιωκεν] ‘persecuted,’ ‘persequebatur,’ Vulg., Clarom., al.; imperf., as designating an action which still spiritually continues; see Winer, *Gr.* § 40. 3, p. 240. Whether the reference is to be regarded as (a) exclusively to Genesis xxi. 9, ΚΠΑΓΩΣ.. ΚΤΗΤΑΝ ΝΟΥΡΑ ΣΧΡΙΤΟΥ (Aif., Ewald, al.), or (b) to an ancient and, since it is thus cited by St Paul, *true* tradition of the Jewish Church (see below), will somewhat depend on the meaning assigned to ΚΠΑΓΩΣ in Gen. l.c. That it *may* mean ‘mocked’ (opp. to Knobel *in loc.*) seems certain from Gen. xxxix. 14, 17, and indeed from the command in Gen. xxi. 10. As however it *does* appear to mean no more than ‘playing like a child,’ παιζών, LXX, ‘ludentem,’ Vulg. (see Tisch. *in loc.*, and Gesen. *Lex.* s. v.), and as Joseph.

ἢ γραφή; Ἐκβαλε τὴν παιδίσκην καὶ τὸν νιὸν αὐτῆς.
οὐ γὰρ μὴ κληρονομήσῃ ὁ νιὸς τῆς παιδίσκης μετὰ τοῦ

(*Antiq.* I. 12. 3) says only κακουργεῖν αὐτὸν δυνάμενον, it seems on the whole best to adopt (b): see *Beresh.* LIII. 15 (Wetst.), ‘Ismael tulit arcum et sagittas et jaculatus est Isaacum, et præ se tulit ac si luderet;’ and Studer (in *Ust.*), who alludes to a similar rabbinical interpretation founded on the cabballistic equivalence in numbers of the letters in ΠΝῦ and the explicit γῆ; comp. *Hackspan, Notes on Script.* Vol. I. p. 220. τὸν καὶ Πνεῦμα] ‘him that was according to the Spirit,’ scil. γεννθέντα, supplied from the preceding clause. It need scarcely be said that the prep. does not here point to the cause or medium, ‘Dei opera’ (*Vatabl.*), but simply means ‘according to,’ i.e. in accordance with the working by promise of the Holy Spirit; comp. Rom. iv. 19, 20. Καὶ σάρκα refers to the natural laws according to which Ishmael was born; καὶ Πνεῦμα to the supernatural laws according to which Isaac was conceived and born. οὕτως καὶ νῦν] ‘so also is it now,’ scil. those descended from Abraham καὶ σάρκα (the Jews) still persecute the free children of promise (the Christians). The sentiment is expressed in general terms, but perhaps may here be conceived as pointed at the pernicious efforts of the Judaizers, which probably involved persecution both spiritual and material; comp. Meyer *in loc.* A good sermon on this text, though with a somewhat special application, will be found in Farindon, *Serm.* XI. Vol. I. p. 287 sq. (ed. 1849).

30. δὲν] ‘Nevertheless.’ strongly consolatory declaration (παραμύθια λεκτή Chrys.) introducing a distinct contrast with the preceding declara-

tion of the persecution, and calling away the thought of the reader to a totally fresh aspect; ‘avocat mentem ab illis tristibus ad illam rem quam jam opponit.’ Klotz, *Devar.* Vol. II. p. 6.

ἢ γραφῇ] ‘the Scripture.’ The following words are really the words of Sarah to Abraham, but confirmed, ver. 12, by God Himself; ‘ejecta est Agar Sarā postulante et Deo annuente.’ Est. The interrogative form which introduces the citation gives it force and vigour; comp. Rom. iv. 3, x. 8, xi. 4. οὐ γὰρ μὴ εἰληρονομήσῃ] ‘shall in no wise be heir.’ emphatic: ‘liberi autem ex concubinâ conditionis servilis aut extraneâ seu gentili a successione plane apud Ebraeos excludebantur.’ Selden, *de Success.* cap. 3, Vol. II. p. 11. Hammond cites the instance of Jephthah, who was thrust out by his brethren, under the second condition of the law, as the son of a strange woman: *Judges* xi. 2. With regard to the use of οὐ μῆ with the aor. subj. [κληρονομήσει BDEN; mss.; Theoph.] it may be observed that the distinction drawn by Hermann (*Æd. Col.* 853) between οὐ μῆ with future indic. (duration or futurity) and with aor. subj. (speedy occurrence) is not applicable to the N. T., on account of (1) the varying readings (as here); (2) the decided violations of the rule where the MSS. are unanimous, e.g. 1 Thess. iv. 15; and (3) the obvious prevalence of the use of the subjunctive over the future, both in the N. T. and ‘fatiscens Græcitas.’ see Lobeck, *Phrym.* p. 722; Thiersch, *Pentat.* II. 15, p. 109; and exx. in Gayler, p. 433. On the general use of the united particles see Winer, *Gr.* § 56. 3, p. 450; and esp. Donalds. *Crat.*

As ye are free, stand nίοντι τῆς ἐλευθέρας. Διό, ἀδελφοί, 31
 fast in your freedom. οὐκ ἐσμὲν παιδίσκης τέκνα ἀλλὰ τῆς ἐλευ-
 θέρας. τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ γὰρ ἡμᾶς Χριστὸς ἤλευθερω—V.

V. I. τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ κ.τ.λ.] The difficulty of deciding on the true reading of this passage, owing to the great variation of MSS., is very great. The reading

§ 394; Gayler, *Partic. Neg.* p. 405, exx. p. 430; and on the best mode of translation, notes on 1 *Thess.* iv. 15 (*Transl.*).

31. διό ‘Therefore,’ commencement of a short semi-paragraph stating the consolatory application of what has preceded (‘quamobrem; aptius duas res conjungit’ Klotz, *Devar.* Vol. II. p. 173), and passing into an exhortation in the following verse. It is very difficult to decide on the exact connexion, as St Paul’s use of διό does not appear to have been very fixed. Sometimes, as Rom. ii. 1, Eph. ii. 11, iii. 13, iv. 25, it begins a paragraph; sometimes (especially with καὶ) it closely connects clauses, as Rom. i. 24, iv. 22, 2 Cor. iv. 13, v. 9, Phil. ii. 9; while in 2 Cor. xii. 10, 1 *Thess.* v. 11 (imperat.), it closes a paragraph, though not in a way strictly similar to the present. On the whole, it seems most probable that St Paul was about to pass on to an application of, not a deduction from, the previous remarks and citation. He commences with διό, but the word ἐλευθέρα suggesting a digression (see Davidson, *Introd.* Vol. II. p. 148), he turns the application, by means of τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ, into an inferential exhortation (Æth. erroneously makes the first clause a reason, ‘quia Christus’), ver. 1, and recommences a new parallel train of thought with τῷ εἶώ. We thus put a slight pause after ch. iv. 30, and a fuller one after ch. v. 1. If ἡμεῖς δὲ be adopted [AC; ms.; Copt.; Cyr. (1), Damasc., al.] the connexion will be more easy.

Ver. 30 describes the fate of the bond-children; ver. 31 will then form a sort of consolatory conclusion, deriving some force from the emphatic κληρον.; ‘but we shall have a different fate; we shall be inheritors, for we are children, not of a bond-maid, but of a free-woman.’ This reading is however more than doubtful, as appearing to be only a repetition from ver. 28. Fer δρα (Rec.), which would perhaps imply a little more decidedly than διό a continuance of what was said (Donaldson, *Crat.* § 192), the external evidence [KL; δρα οὐν FG, Theodrt.] is very weak, and the probability of correction not inconsiderable.

παιδίσκης] ‘of a bond-maid,’ scil. ‘of any bond-maid.’ The omission of the article may be accounted for,—not by the negative form of the proposition (Middleton *in loc.*), but by the principle of correlation, whereby when the governing article is anarthrous (here possibly so after the predicative ἐσμὲν Middl. p. 43), the governed becomes anarthrous also; see Middl. *Gr. Art.* III. 3.7, p. 50 (ed. Rose), comp. Winer, *Gr.* § 19. 2. b, p. 113 sq. As however παιδίσκη appears in every other place with the art. (even after the prep. in ver. 23), the present omission is perhaps more probably regarded as intentional, and as designed to give a general character to the Apostle’s conclusion; see Peile *in loc.* Τῆς ἐλευθέρας however cannot be translated ‘of a free-woman.’

CHAPTER V. I. τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ κ.τ.λ.] ‘Stand firm then in the freedom for

τεν στήκετε οὖν, καὶ μὴ πάλιν ζυγῷ δουλείας ἐνέχεσθε.

of *Lachm.*, τῇ ἀλευθερᾱͅ ἡμᾶς Χριστὸς ἀλευθέρωσεν στήκετε οὖν, is plausible, and well supported, as γ̄ is omitted by ABCD^N; 8 mss.; Copt., Damasc., al.; still the doubtful meaning of the dat. ἀλευθερ. (not the article, at which Rück. stumbles) and the abrupt character of the whole, make it on internal grounds very difficult to admit. *Tisch.* (sp. *Mathi.*, *Scholz.*, *Rinck.*, *Rück.*, *Olsb.*, al., though differing in other points) seems rightly to have retained γ̄ with D³EKL (FG γ̄ ἀλευθ. ἡμ., comp. *Vulg.*, *Clarom.*); mss.; Syr.; Chrys., Theod. (2), al., as the Η is less likely to have arisen from a repetition of the first letter of ΗΜΑΣ (*Mey.*), than to have been omitted from having been accidentally merged in it. His omission of οὖν however, with DE; *Vulg.*, *Clarom.*, Syr. (*Philox.*); Theodrt. (2); against ABC^IFG; 10 mss.; Boern., Aug., Goth., Copt., al.; Cyr., Aug., al.—does not seem tenable. The order Χριστὸς ἡμᾶς (*Rec.*) has but weak external support [CKL; mss.; appy. some Vv.; Chrys., Theod.] and is reversed by most recent editors.

which, &c.' inferential exhortation from the declaration immediately preceding. Of the many explanations which the expression τῇ ἀλευθερᾱͅ στήκειν has received, the two following appear to be the most probable; (a) 'libertati stare, quam deserere est nefas,' Fritz. *Rom.* xii. 12, Vol. III. p. 80; Winer, *Gr.* § 31. 3. obs. p. 244 (ed. 5; less distinctly p. 188, ed. 6); (β) 'quod attinet ad libertatem stare,' Bretsch., Meyer, on 2 *Cor.* i. 24. The objection to (a) is that such expressions as τῇ θλιψει ὑπομένειν are not strictly similar, as the idea of a hostile attitude (dat. incommodi) is involved in the dative, 'calamitatem non subterfugientes; &c.' so ὑποτίμηται τινι, μέρει τινι (*Bernh. Synt.* III. 13. b, p. 98), and Hom. *Il.* xxi. 600, στήπαι τινι. The latter interpretation seems thus the most correct; the dative however must not be translated too laxly ('as regards the freedom'), as it serves to call attention to the exact sphere in which and to which the action is limited, e.g. ἔστη τῇ διανοᾱͅ, Polyb. XXI. 9. 3; see Scheuerl. *Synt.* § 22. 2, p. 179, and notes on ch. i. 22. It may be remarked that we sometimes find an

inserted ἐν (1 Cor. xvi. 13, comp. Rück.) without much apparent difference of meaning, still it does not seem hypercritical to say that in this latter case the idea of the 'sphere or element in which' was designed by the writer to come more distinctly into view; comp. Winer, *Gr.* § 31. 8, p. 194. On the meaning of στήκειν, which *per se* is only 'stare' (*Vulg.*, *Clarom.*), but which derives its fuller meaning from the context, comp. Chrys., στήκετε εἰπών, τὸν σάλον ἔδειξε and see notes on *Phil.* i. 27.

γ̄] 'for which,' dat. commodi. The usual ablative explanation 'quā nos liberavit' (*Vulg.*), scil. ἡμῖν ἔδωκεν (so expressly Conyb.), may perhaps be justified by the common constructions χαρίει χαρᾶ, &c.; but as it is very doubtful whether this construct. occurs in St Paul's Epp. (1 Thess. iii. 9 seems an instance of attraction; see notes in loc.), it seems safer to adhere to the former explanation; see Meyer *in loc.* (obs.).

For a good sermon on the notion of Christian liberty, see Bp. Hall, *Serm.* XXVI. Vol. v. p. 339 sq. (Talboys). πάλιν refers to the previous subservience of the Galatians to heathenism; see notes on ch.

If ye submit to circumcision, ye are bound to keep the whole law, and your union with Christ is entirely void.

**"Ιδε ἐγώ Παῦλος λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι ἔὰν 2
περιτέμνησθε Χριστὸς ὑμᾶς οὐδὲν ᾠφε-
λήσει. μαρτύρομαι δὲ πάλιν παντὶ 3**

iv. 9. [ὑγῆ δουλείας] 'the yoke of bondage,' not 'a yoke *etc.*' Copt., Ewald, al.; the anarthrous δουλεία (comp. Winer, *Gr.* § 19. 1, p. 109) being appy. used somewhat indefinitely to mark the general character of the γύγη, and by the principle of correlation causing the governing noun to lose its article; see Middleton, *Gr. Art.* III. 3. 6, and comp. notes on ch. v. 31. It will be observed that τῶν is more easily explained on the hypothesis of γύγη being taken indefinitely; the present view however seems most in accordance with the definite statement in ver. 2; [ὑγή δὲ δουλείας τὴν κατὰ τόμον γνήν] Theod. On the use of the gen. as denoting the predominant nature or quality inherent in the governing noun, see Scheuerl. *Synt.* § 16. 3, p. 115; and comp. Soph. *Aj.* 944, οἵα δουλείας ἡγάδε. Aesch. *Agam.* 360, δουλείας γάγγαμον. ἐνέχεσθε] 'be held fast,' not exactly [ἀπόταλλον] [mancipemini, subjiciatis vos], but simply 'implicamini,' Beza,—with ref. perhaps to the tenacity of the hold, and the difficulty of shaking it off; comp. Beng. For exx. of the use of the verb both in a physical (Herod. II. 121, ἐνέχομαι τῇ τάρῃ), and in an ethical sense (Plutarch, *Symp.* II. qu. 3. 1, ἐνέχεσθαι δύγμασι Πυθαγορικοῖς), see Kypke, *Obs.* Vol. II. p. 285, and Wetst. *in loc.*

2. [τε ἄγώ Παῦλος] 'Behold I Paul;' emphatic and warning declaration (πόση ἀπειλή, Chrys.) of the dangerous consequences and worse than uselessness of undergoing circumcision. The Apostle's introduction of his own name (comp. 2 Cor.

x. 1, Eph. iii. 1) prefaced by the arresting τε ('attentionem excitantis est,' Grot.) has been differently explained. The most natural view seems to be that it was to increase conviction (θαρροῦντος τῷ οἷς λέγει' Chrys.; comp. Theod.) and to add to the assertion the weight of his Apostolic dignity; τῇς τοῦ προσώπου δικαιοπιστίας ἀρκούσης διητὶ πάσης διωδείξεως' Chrys. On the accentuation of τε, which according to the grammarians is oxyton in Attic and paroxyton in non-Attic Greek, see Winer, *Gr.* § 6. 1, p. 47.

[δέντε περιτέμνειν.] 'if ye be circumcised;' i.e. 'if you continue to follow that rite,' the present marking the action as one still going on. On the use of δέντε with pres. subj., comp. notes on ch. i. 8, 9. οὐδὲν ἀφελήσει] 'shall profit you nothing;' the fut. having no ref. whatever to the nearness of the Lord's παρούσια (Mey.), but simply marking the certain result of such a course of practice; 'Christ (as you will find) will never profit you anything;' see Winer, *Gr.* § 40. 6, p. 250, and comp. Schmalf. *Synt.* § 57, p. 116 sq.

3. μαρτύρομαι δέ] 'Yea I bear witness,' 'testificor autem,' Vulg., Claram.; not 'enim,' Beza; further and slightly contrasted statement; the δέ not being merely connective, but as usual implying a certain degree of opposition between the clause it introduces and the preceding declaration; 'not only will Christ prove no benefit to you, *but* you will in addition become debtors to the law:' see Klotz, *Devar.* Vol. II. p. 362; Hermann, *Viger.* No. 343. b; and for a notice of the similar use of 'autem,' Hand,

ἀνθρώπῳ περιτεμνομένῳ ὅτι ὁφειλέτης ἐστὶν ὅλον τὸν
4 νόμον ποιῆσαι. κατηργήθητε ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ οἵτινες
5 ἐν νόμῳ δικαιοῦσθε, τῆς χάριτος ἔξεπέσατε. ἡμεῖς γὰρ

Tursell. Vol. I. p. 562. The verb *μαρτύρομαι*, a δἰς λεγόμ. in St Paul's Epp. (Eph. iv. 17, comp. Acts xx. 26), is here used in the sense of *μαρτυροῦμαι*, appy. involving the idea of a solemn declaration, as if before witnesses; comp. notes on Eph. iv. 17. That there is no ellipsis of Θεὸς (Hilgenf., Bretschn.) appears plainly from Eph. l.c., and from the similar usage of the word in classical Greek, e.g. Plato, *Phileb.* p. 47 C, *ταῦτα δὲ τότε μὲν οὐκ ἐμαρτυράμεθα, νῦν δὲ λέγομεν.* Dindorf in Steph. *Thes.* a.v. cites Eustath. *Il.* p. 1221. 33, ὃς αἱ λοτορίαι μαρτύρονται. τάλας may refer to the preceding verse, or to a previous declaration of the same kind made by word of mouth. The former is more probable, as *ταῦται ἀνθρώπῳ* appears a more expanded application of ὑμῖν, ver. 2; οὐχ ὑμῖν λέγω μένον, φησί, δλλὰ καὶ *ταῦται ἀνθρώπῳ περιτεμνομένῳ* Chrys.; see Neander, *Planting*, Vol. I. p. 214 note (Bohn). *περιτεμνομένῳ* 'submitting to be circumcised,' 'undergoing circumcision,' 'circumcidentis se,' Vulg., Clarom., or more idiomatically 'qui curat se circumcidiri,' Beza,—but less accurately, as the participle is anarthrous, and what is called a tertiary predicate; see Donalds, *Crat.* § 306, and *Gr.* § 495. The tense *περιτεμν.*, not *περιτμηθέντι* or *περιτεμημένῳ*, must not be overlooked: it was not the circumcised *as such* that had become in this strict sense δικαιοῦσαι δλον τὸν νόμον ποιῆσαι, but he who was designedly undergoing the rite. "Ολος, as its position shows, is emphatic; διηρ ἐφειλκὼν τὴν δεσποτελαν" Chrys.

4. κατηργήθητε ἀπὸ τοῦ Χρ.^o] 'Ye were done away from Christ,' 'Your union with Christ became void,' scil. 'when you entered upon the course which now ye are pursuing;' further and forcible explanation of Χριστὸς ὑμᾶς οὐδὲν ὠφελήσει (ver. 2), the absence of all connecting particles serving to give the statement both vigour and emphasis. The construction is what is called 'praeognans' (*Rom.* vii. 2, 6, see Winer, *Gr.* 66. 2, p. 547); δπό, strictly considered, not belonging to κατηργήθητε in the sense of ηγενθήσατε δπό, but to some word which can easily be supplied, e.g. κατηργήθητε καὶ ἐχωρίσθητε ἀπὸ Χρ., 'nulli estis redditi et a Christo avulsi'; comp. 2 Cor. xi. 3, φθείρεσθαι δπό, and see Fritz. *Rom.* l.c. Vol. II. p. 8, 9.

The verb καταργέω is a favourite word with St Paul, being used in his Epp. (the Ep. to the Hebrews not being included) twenty-five times. In the rest of the N.T. it is used only twice, Luke xiii. 7, Heb. ii. 14, and in the whole LXX only four times, all in Esdras. It is rare in ordinary Greek; see Eurip. *Phæniss.* 753, and Polyb. *Frag. Hist.* 69. The τοῦ is omitted by Lachm. with BCD^{FGN}; 2 mss.; Theoph.; but, as being less usual, esp. when preceded by a prep., is more probably to be retained, with AD³EKL; nearly all mss.; Chrys., Theod., Dam., al. (*Tisch.*). ἐν νόμῳ δικαιοῦσθε] 'are being justified in the law,' 'in lego,' Vulg., Clarom.; ἐν not being instrumental (Ewald), but pointing to the sphere of the action; comp. notes on ch. iii. 11. The pres. δικαιοῦσθε is correctly re-

Πνεύματι ἐκ πίστεως ἐλπίδα δικαιοσύνης ἀπεκρέχύμεθα.

ferred by the principal ancient and modern commentators to the feelings of the subject (*ὡς ὑπολαμβάνειν*, Theophyl.; 'ut vobis videtur,' Fritz, *Opusc.* p. 156); comp. Goth. 'garahtans qibib Izvis' [*Justos dicitis vos*]. On this use of the subjective present (commonly employed to indicate certainty, prophetic confidence, expectation of speedy issue, &c.), see Bernh. *Synt.* x. 2, p. 371, and Schmalfeld, *Synt.* § 54. 2, p. 91.

τῆς χάριτος ἐξενέστε] 'ye fell away from grace.' the aor., as in the first clause, referring to the time when legal justification was admitted and put forward; see however notes to *Transl.* On the meaning of *ἐκπίπτετος* ('aliquā re excidere, scil. ejus jacturam facere') see Winer, *De Verb.* Comp. *Fasc.* II. p. 11, and comp. Plato, *Rep.* vi. p. 496 C, *ἐκπεσεῖν φιλοσοφίας*; Polyb. XII. 14. 7, *ἐκπίπτετον καθήκοντος*. The Alexandrian form of aor. *ἐξενέστε* is noticed and illustrated by exx. in Winer, *Gr.* § 13. I, p. 68 sq.; comp. Lobeck, *Phryne*. p. 724.

5. *ἡμεῖς γάρ]* 'For we;' proof of the preceding assertion by a declaration *e contrario* of the attitude of hope and expectancy, not of legal reliance and self-confidence, which was the characteristic of the Apostle and of all true Christians. If δὲ had been used, the opposition between *ἡμεῖς* and *οἱ άλλοι* (*οἱ μεῖς*) would have been more prominent than would seem in harmony with the context and with the conciliatory character of the present address.

Πνεύματι 'by the Spirit,' 'Spiritu,' Vulg., Claram.,—with an implied contrast to the *σάρξ* which was the active principle of all legal righteousness; comp. ch. iii. 3, and notes *in loc.*

The dative is not equivalent to *ἐπ* *Πνεύματι* (Copt.), still less to be explained as merely adverbial, 'spiritually' (Middl. *in loc.*); but, as the context suggests, has its definite ablative force and distinct personal reference; our hope flows from faith, and that faith is imparted and quickened by the Holy Spirit. No objection can be urged against this interpr. founded on the absence of the article, as neither the canon of Middleton (*Gr. Art.* p. 126, ed. Rose), nor the similar one suggested by Harless (*Ephes.* ii. 22),—that *τὸ Πνεῦμα* is the personal Holy Spirit, *πνεῦμα* the indwelling influence of the Spirit (*Rom.* viii. 5),—can at all be considered of universal application; see ver. 16. It is much more natural to regard *Πνεῦμα*, *Πνεῦμα ἄγιον*, and *Πνεῦμα Θεοῦ* as proper names, and to extend to them the same latitude in connexion with the article; see Fritz. *Rom.* viii. 4, Vol. II. p. 105.

ἐκ πίστεως] 'from faith,' as the origin and source (comp. notes on ch. iii. 22),—in opposition to the *ἐν νόμῳ* of the preceding clause, which practically includes the more regular antithesis *εἰς ἔργαν*.

δικαιοσύνης] 'the hope of righteousness.' This is one of those many passages in the N. T. (see Winer, *Gr.* § 30. 1, p. 168) in which it is difficult to decide whether the genitive is *subjecti* or *objecti*; the *ἐν δικαιῳ*, 'spem et justitiam (eternam),' suggested by Aquinas, being clearly inadmissible. If (a) the gen. be *subjecti*, *δικαιος* must be 'ipsum primum quod speratur, sc. vitam eternam' (Grot.), 'coronam glorie quae justificatos manet' (Beza), *δικαιος* being used *μετωνυμικῶς* for the thing hoped for; if (b) *objecti*, then simply 'spera-

6 ἐν γὰρ Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ οὕτε περιτομή τι ἴσχυει οὕτε ἀκροβυστία, ἀλλὰ πίστις δι' ἀγάπης ἐνεργουμένη.

tam justitiam,' the hope which turns on δικαιοσύνη as its object,—fairly paraphrased by ΖΕθ., 'we hope we may be justified;' sim. Tynd., Cran. Of these (*β*) seems clearly most in accordance with the context, as this turns not so much upon any adjunct to δικαιοσύνη as upon δικαιοσύνη itself; 'Ye,' says St Paul, in ver. 4, 'think that ye are already in possession of δικαιος. (δικαιοῦσθε), we on the contrary *hope for it.*' There is no difficulty in δικαιοσύνη thus being represented *future*. For in the first place this view necessarily results from the contrast between Judaism and Christianity. The Jew regarded δικαιος. as something outward, present, realizable: the Christian as something inward, future, and, save through faith in Christ, unattainable. And in the second place, δικαιοσύνη is one of those divine results which, as Neander beautifully expresses it, 'stretch into eternity': it conveys with it and involves the idea of future blessedness and glorification; οὐδὲ κατωφετοῖς καὶ ἔδιξασεν, Rom. viii. 30; see Neand. *Planting*, Vol. I. p. 478 note (Bohn). *ἀπεκδεχόμεθα*] 'tarry for,' 'patiently wait for.' This expressive compound has two meanings, (*a*) *local*, with reference either to the place *from which* the expectation is directed to its object ('in quo locatus aliquem expectes,' Fritz.), or, more usually, the place *whence* the object is expected to come ('unde quid expectaretur,' Winer),—a decided trace of which meaning may be observed in Phil. iii. 20: (*b*) *ethical*, with ref. to the assiduity of the expectation, 'studiose constanter expectare,'—the meaning in the present case and appy. in all

the remaining passages in the N. T.; comp. Rom. viii. 19, 23, 25, 1 Cor. i. 7, Heb. ix. 28, 1 Pet. iii. 20 (*Lachm., Tisch.*): and see Tittmann, *Synon.* p. 106; Fritz. *Opusc.* p. 156; Winer, *Verb. Comp.* Fasc. IV. p. 14. It may be added that the expression ἀλτ. δικ. ἔπειδε, is not pleonastic for ἀλτ. δικ. ἔχομεν (Ust.; comp. ΖΕθ.), but, as Fritz. observes, forcible 'and almost poetical' (*Eur. Alcest.* 130, ἀλπίδα προσδέχωμαι), ἀλπίδα being the cognate accus.; compare Acts xxiv. 15, ἀλπίδα...ἥν καὶ αὐτὸι οὗτοι προσδέχονται' Tit. ii. 13, προσδέχομενοι τὴν μακαρίαν ἀλπίδα. The whole clause then may be thus paraphrased: 'by the assistance of the Holy Spirit we are enabled to cherish the hope of being justified, and the source out of which that hope springs is faith:' comp. Ust. *Lehrb.* II. I. p. 90 sq.; and for a fuller exposition of the verse, Chillingworth, *Works*, p. 402 sq. (Lond. 1704); Manton, *Serm. Vol. IV.* p. 927 sq. (Lond. 1698).

6. ἐν γὰρ Χριστῷ Ἰησ.] 'For in Christ Jesus,' confirmation of the preceding statement that the *δρεκδοχή* was *ἐκ πίστεως* when there is a union with Christ, neither circumcision nor uncircumcision avails anything, but faith only; it is clear then why we entertain the hope of righteousness *from faith*. The solemn formula *ἐν Χρ.* 'Ιησ. is not to be explained away, as 'in Christi regno, ecclesia' (*Πατέρεus*, 'Christi religione' (*Εστ.*), 'Christi legē' (*Γρότ.*),—all of which fall utterly short of the true meaning; but, as the regular use of *ἐν Χρ.* and the addition of 'Ιησοῦ distinctly suggest, it conveys the deeper idea of 'union, fellowship, and incorporation' in Christ

Who perverted you? Whosoever they are, they shall be punished, for their doctrine is not mine. Yea, I wish they would cease from all communion with you.

crucified: comp. notes on ch. ii. 17. For an elaborate but wholly insufficient explanation of the vital expression *ἐν Χρ.*, comp. Fritz. *Rom.* viii. 1, Vol. II. p. 82; and contrast with it the deep and spiritual illustrations of Bp. Hall, *Christ Mystical*, ch. 2, 3.

διάπτης ἐνεργουμένη 'energizing, displaying its activity through love,' *ἱώσα δεικνυται*, Theoph.; 'efficax est,' Bull, Andrewes (*Serm. v.* Vol. III. p. 193); comp. 1 Thess. i. 3, *τοῦ κόπου τῆς ἀγάπης*: Polyb. *ad Phil.* § 3, *πλοτίῳ ... ἐνακολουθούσῃ τῆς ἀλπίδος, προσγονόσης τῆς διάπτης* and see especially Ust. *Lehrb.* II. I. 4, p. 236 sq., and references in notes on 1 Thess. l.c. The verb *ἐνεργεῖσθαι* may have two meanings, (a) passive, 'is made perfect,'

ἵσταται? [quae perficitur, Schaaf, but see Capell. in loc.] Syr., 'adshueghyal,' Arm.—maintained by the older Romanist divines, Bellarm., al. (see Petav. *de Incarn.* VIII. 12. 16, Vol. v. p. 407), as well as several Protestant interpreters, Hammond, al., and even the recent editors of Steph. *Thesaur.* s.v.; or (b) active, 'is operative,' Vulg., Claram., Goth., Copt.,—as maintained by nearly all recent commentators. Of these (a) is quite lexically tenable (Polyb. *Hist.* I. 13. 5, *ἐνεργεῖται πόλεμος*), but distinctly at variance with the usage of the word in the N.T. (see Meyer, 2 Cor. i. 6; Bretsch. *Lex.* s. v.), while (b) harmonizes with the prevailing usage, and can be correctly distinguished from the active; *ἐνεργεῖν* being 'viri exercere,' and commonly applied to persons, *ἐνεργεῖσθαι* 'ex se (aut suam) viri exercere,' a species of what has been called the 'dynamic' middle (Krüger, *Sprachl.* § 52. 8), and com-

monly applied to things, see Fritz. *Rom.* Vol. II. p. 17, and Winer, *Gr.* § 38. 6, p. 231. Although the pass. meaning is not now maintained by the best critical scholars of the Church of Rome, the passage is no less strongly claimed as a testimony to the truth of the Tridentine doctrine (Sess. VI. c. 7) of *fides formata*; see Windischm. *in loc.*, and comp. Möhler, *Symbolik*, § 16, p. 131 note, § 17, p. 137.

7. **ἐτρέχετε καλῶς** 'Ye were running well;' forcible and yet natural transition from the brief statement of the characterizing principle of Christian life, once exemplified in the Galatians, but now lost sight of and perverted; *ἔταινει τὸν δρόμον καὶ θρηνεῖ τὸν δρόμον τὴν παῦλαν* Theod. **τίς ὑμᾶς ἐνέκοψεν** 'who did hinder you?' not without some expression of surprise, *πῶς ὁ τοσοῦτος ἐνεκόπη δρόμος; τίς ὁ τοσοῦτος λοχύσας*; Chrys.: comp. ch. iii. 1. The primary meaning of the verb *ἐγκόπτειν* (*ἐνεκόπτομην* Ἐνετοδιζόμην, Hesych.; *δραχαίτιζειν* δραχαίτιζει, *ἐγκόπτει*, Suid.) appears to be that of *hindering by breaking up a road* (e.g. Greg.-Nazianz. *Or.* XVI. p. 260, *ἢ κακλας ἐγκόπτομένης δυσπάθειᾳ τῶν πονηρῶν, ἢ ἀρετῇς ὀδοτοικομένης εὐπαθειᾳ τῶν βελτιώνων* comp. 'intercidere,' e.g. Cass. *Bell. Gall.* II. 9, *pontem, &c.*); while that of *drakónτειν* (*Rec.*) is rather that of *hindrance* with the further idea of *thrusting back*; comp. Hom. *Odyss.* xxi. 47, *θυρέων δὲνέκοπτεν δχῆς*. The reading of *Rec.* (*δρέκοψεν*) is however opposed to all the uncial MSS. and appy. to nearly all mss. and Ff., and neither on internal (opp. to Bloomf.) nor external grounds has any claim to attention. The accus. is similarly

8 τῇ ἀληθείᾳ μὴ πείθεσθαι; η̄ πεισμονὴ οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ

found with ἔγκριτειν, *Acts xxiv. 4*, *1 Thess. ii. 18*; see also *Themist. Or. XIV. p. 181 c.* τῇ δλῆθειᾳ μὴ πείθεσθαι] ‘that ye should not obey the truth;’ infin. expressive of the result or effect, with some trace of the purpose or end contemplated; this being one of those forms of the ‘consecutive’ sentence which may be regarded as partly objective and as partly final; see Donalds. *Gr. § 602*. The popular explanation that μὴ with the infin. after certain negative and prohibitive verbs is pleonastic (Mey. comp. Herm. *Viger.* No. 271) is now justly called in question (see esp. Klotz, *Devar.* Vol. II. p. 668), the true explanation being that the μὴ is prefixed to the infinitive, whether in its more simple objective form (Donalds. *Gr. § 584 sq.*), or its more lax and general ref. to result (*Bernh. Synt. IX. 6. b.* p. 364; Madvig, *Synt. § 156. 4.*), to indicate the further idea of some latent purpose involved in the action which specially contemplated or tended to the effect expressed by the infinitive; see esp. Schmalfeld, *Synt. § 181. 2.* p. 359, and for an illustrative example comp. Aristoph. *Pax.* 315, δύποδῶν ἡμῖν γένηται τὴν θεὸν μὴ ἔξελκουσα· see Madvig, *Synt. § 210*. The elliptical mode of explanation adopted by Gayler (*de Partic. Neg.* p. 359) in the parallel expressions δροῦμαι μὴ δρᾶσαι, sc. ‘nego, et dico me non fecisse’ is appy. doubtful in principle, and certainly is not here applicable.

Lachm. (ed. min.) omitted the article before δλῆθ. with AB; and appy. a few mss.; and is now supported by R.

8. η̄ πεισμονή] ‘The persuasion,’ ‘suasio,’ Clarom., scil. ‘servandi legalia,’ Lyra; the subst. being regarded as active, and the article (not ‘this pers.’ Arm., Auth.,—a most doubtful

usage in the N. T., see Winer, *Gr. § 18. 1.* p. 97 sq.) marking the particular (counter-)persuading of the false teachers implied in the τὶς ὑμᾶς ἐτέκοψεν. Owing to the apparent paronomasia, and the nature of the termination (comp. Donalds. *Cratyl.* § 255), the meaning of πεισμονὴ is slightly doubtful. As the similar form πληρομονὴ means both *satietas* (the state) and *explicatio* (the act), *Cal. II. 73*, *Plato, Symp.* p. 186 c, πλ. καὶ κένωσις,—so πεισμονὴ may mean (a) the state of being persuaded, i. e. ‘conviction’ (*Θεοῦ τὸ καλέω τὸ δὲ πειθεσθαι τῷ θνατουμένῳ* Theod.), or (b) the act of persuading, ‘persuadendi sollertia,’ Schott; comp. Chrys. on *1 Thess. i. 4*, οὐ πεισμανὴ ἀθροκτηνη... τὸ η̄... πεισθεῖσα. Of these (a) has here the support of the Greek expositors (*τὸ πεισθῆσαι τοὺς λέγουσας*, *Ecum.*, comp. Chrys., Theoph.), and certainly on that account deserves consideration; (b) however is to be preferred, as lexically defensible (see below), and as in harmony with the active τοῦ καλοῦντος η̄ πεισμ. pointing to a gracious act in which the human will is regarded more as subjected to the divine influence (John vi. 44), τοῦ καλ. to one in which it is regarded more as free; comp. Mey. in loc. In three out of the four instances cited by Wetst. from Eustath. (*ad II. a.* p. 21. 46; 99. 45, *II. 4*, p. 637. 5), the prevailing meaning appears to be ‘pervicacia;’ but in Justin Mart. *Apol. I. 53*, αὐταρκεῖς εἰς πεισμονήν Epiphan. *Hæres. XXX. 21*, εἰς πεισμονήν τῆς ἐαυτῶν πληροφορίας Apollon. *de Synt.* p. 195. 10, τὴν ἐξ δλῆθλων πρὸς δλῆθλους πεισμονήν, the active meaning is sufficiently distinct. Ignat. *Rom. 3*, is commonly adduced, but here Cod. Colb. reads σωτῆσ. οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ καλοῦντος] ‘is not from

καλοῦντος ὑμᾶς. μικρὰ ζύμη ὅλου τὸ φύραμα ζυμοῖ. 9
ἐγὼ πέποιθα εἰς ὑμᾶς ἐν Κυρίῳ ὅτι οὐδὲν ἄλλο φρονή- 10

*him who calleth you,' i. e. does not emanate, does not result from, see note, ch. ii. 16; not an answer to the preceding question,—which is rather an expression of surprise than a mere interrogation,—but a warning declaration. The δ καλῶν is obviously not St Paul (Locke), nor even Christ (Theoph.), but as usual, God; the act of *calling* in St Paul's Epp. (e.g. Rom. ix. 11, 24; 1 Cor. i. 9, vii. 15, al.) being regularly ascribed to the Father; see notes and reff. on ch. i. 6. The tense of the participle need not be pressed either as a definite pres. ('non desinit etiam nunc vocare,' Beza), or still less probably, as an imperf. ('qui vos vocabat,' Beng.),—δ καλῶν, as Chrys. appears to have felt (*οὐκ ἔκλεσεν διμᾶς δ καλῶν*), being only the common substantival participle; see the numerous exx. collected by Winer, *Gr.* § 45. 7, p. 316; comp. Bernhardy, *Synt.* vi. 23, p. 318; Madvig, *Syntax*, § 180. b; and notes on 1 *Thess.* v. 24.*

9. μικρὰ [ζύμη κ.τ.λ.] 'A little leaven leavener the whole lump,' proverbially expressed warning (comp. 1 Cor. v. 7), forming a sort of antithetical continuation of what has preceded. It is somewhat doubtful whether ζύμη is to be considered as (a) having an abstract reference to the false teaching (τὸ μαρὸν τοῦτο κακόν, Chrys.; comp. Theoph.), or as (b) pointing in the concrete ('hi pauci,' Parseus; comp. Aug., Jerome) to those who disseminated it; see Clem. *Hom.* VIII. 17 (cited by Hilgenf.), where the race of men living before the flood are characterized as a κακὴ ζύμη. On the one hand, (a) yields a pertinent sense, and is appy. confirmed by Matth. xvi. 11, and by 1 Cor. l. c. where ver. 8 seems distinctly to show that ζύμη does not

mean the individual so much as his sin: on the other, the active meaning assigned to πεισμοῦ, and still more the seeming quantitative limitation hinted at in the use of the individualizing singular in ver. 10 (comp. Beng.) appears to preponderate in favour of (b). We adopt therefore the concrete reference, and necessarily continue it to the following φύραμα: 'vel pauci homines perperam docentes possent omnem [totum] castum corrumpere:' Winer in loc.

10. ἐγώ] 'I for my part,' emphatic, and not without a reassuring contrast. The insertion of δὲ [C'FG; a few mss.; Demid., Aug., Syr.-Phil., al.] is due to the desire to make this contrast still more apparent.

εἰς ὑμᾶς] 'with regard to you;' this more lax use of εἰς is noticed by Winer, *Gr.* § 49, p. 354, and Bernh. *Synt.* v. 11. 3, p. 220. The addition of the words ἐν Κυρίῳ (sc. Ἰησοῦ, Rom. xiv. 14, comp. Winer, *Gr.* § 19. 1, p. 113) serves to designate the ground of the hope, and to show that it was not an earthly and doubtful, but a heavenly (Phil. ii. 24) and certain assurance which St Paul entertained; comp. 2 Thess. iii. 4, πεισθάμεν δὲ ἐν Κυρίῳ ἐφ' ὑμᾶς, where ἐν is used, in a sense little differing from that of εἰς here, to denote the objects about whom the hope was felt, ἐν Κυρ. the nature of that hope; see notes on 2 *Thess.* l. c., where distinctions are drawn between the ethical uses of εἰς, ἐν, and πρός.

οὐδὲν ἄλλο] 'nothing else,'—than what? Either *specially*,—than the subject and purport of the words immediately preceding; or *generally*,—than the doctrines which St Paul had propounded. The latter accords best with the future φρονήσει,

σετε· ὁ δὲ ταράσσων ὑμᾶς βαστάσει τὸ κρίμα, ὅστις
τι ἀν ἦ. ἐγὼ δέ, ἀδελφοί, εἰ περιτομὴν ἔτι κηρύσσω, τί ἔτι

io. *ὅστις ἀν]* Tisch. (ed. 7) reads *ἄν* with ABN; 3 mss.

which seems more naturally used in reference to the general issue (*ὅτι δυορθώσεσθε*, Chrys.), than merely to the time when the words would be read. Alf. refers to Phil. iii. 15 (comp. Usteri, ‘no novel sentiments’), but there the word is *ἐτέρως*: see notes *in loc.*
ὁ δὲ ταράσσων] ‘but he that disturbeth you.’ contrast, not with the preceding *ἐγώ* (Rück.), but generally with the expression of confidence which has just preceded; *ὁ ταράσσων* not being used on the one hand for *οἱ ταράσσοντες* (Brown), nor on the other, in ref. to some *one particular* false teacher (Olsh.); contrast Davids. *Introd.* Vol. II. p. 315), but, in accordance with the exact selective and definitive force of the article, to the one who for the time being comes under observation.
Οἱ ταράσσοντες ὑμᾶς (ch. i. 7) are the class generally, *ὁ ταράσσων* is the individual of the class who may happen to call forth the Apostle’s censure; *ἔπήρε τὸν λόγον*, Chrys.; comp. Madvig, *Synt.* § 14. **βαστάσει**
τὸ κρίμα] ‘shall bear’ (‘ut grave onus,’ Beng.) the judgment (*he deserves*); *κρίμα* not being equivalent to *καρδικρίμα*, nor used as cause for effect, sc. ‘punishment’ (Schott, Olsh.), but retaining its proper meaning both here and Rom. ii. 3, al. and with app. ref. to the judgment which he will receive from God; *δικαὶς δικείλονται τῷ Θεῷ*. Theod. The idea of ‘punishment,’ or ‘condemnation,’ is conveyed by, and to be deduced from the *context*; see Fritz. *Rom. l. c.*, Vol. I. p. 94.
ὅστις ἀν ἦ] ‘whoever he may be,’ not with any reference to the dignity of the momentarily-selected individual (*καὶ μεγάλου τως δοκῶσι καὶ ἀξι-*

πιστοι: Theoph.), but simply with the usual *inclusive* reference of the formula; comp. Acts iii. 23.

ii. *ἴγε δέ, ἀδελφοί!* ‘But I, brethren,’—with abrupt reference to what might have been said of himself. The connexion between this and the preceding verse is not perfectly clear. The use of the expression *ὁ ταράσσων* appears to have suggested the remembrance that he himself was open to the charge of being a subverter, inasmuch as he had circumcised Timothy. The reply is final and decisive; ‘But if it be a fact that I really do still preach *circumcision*, what further ground is there for persecuting me?’ i.e. ‘the very fact of my persecution is a proof that I am not a preacher of circumcision;’ see esp. Theoph. *in loc.*
εἰ περιτ. ἔτι κηρύσσω] ‘if I preach circumcision,’ ‘if, as is assumed to be a matter of fact (comp. notes on ch. i. 9), *circumcision* is still what I preach;’ the emphasis resting not on *κηρύσσω* (*τουτέστι οὐκ οὕτω κελεύω πιστεύειν...* *περιέπεμπον μὲν γάρ [τὸν Τιμόθεον]*], οὐκ ἐκήρυξα δὲ *περιτομήν*, Chrys.) but on the prominently placed *περιτομή*. The *ἔτι* does not suggest any contrasted reference to the period before the coming of Christ (‘still—as in the ante-Christian times,’ Olsh.),—a reference which would here be very pointless, nor again to any special change in the Apostle’s teaching since he had become a Christian,—for which there is not the *slightest* grounds; but simply to the period prior to his conversion, ‘*still*, in contrast to my former Judaism;’ comp. Wieseler, *Chronol.* p. 206, note. The Apostle might not have ‘preached’ circum-

διώκομαι; ἄρα κατίργηται τὸ σκάνδαλον τοῦ σταυροῦ.
ὅφελον καὶ ἀποκόψονται οἱ ἀναστατοῦντες ὑμᾶς.

12

cision before his conversion, but he strenuously advocated (*περισσοτέρως γῆλωτης ὑπάρχων τῶν πατρικῶν μου παραδόσεων* ch. i. 14) all the principles of Judaism; comp. Neander, *Planting*, p. 304, note. The present tense is probably used, as Schott observes, from his having the present accusation of his adversaries in his mind.

τι ἔτι διώκομαι] 'why am I still persecuted?' almost 'why am I to be, &c.' this second *ἔτι* being, as De Wette observes, *logical*; see Rom. iii. 7, *τι* *ἔτι* *κάγῳ* *ὡς ἀμαρτωλὸς κρίνομαι*; 'what further ground is there for, &c.' Rom. ix. 19, al. ἄρα] 'then after all,' 'ergo,' Vulg., Clarom. (see Hand, *Tursell.* Vol. II. p. 450 sq.); inference from what has preceded, not perhaps here without some tinge of ironical reference to a conclusion that could not have been expected. The fundamental idea of *ἄρα* is 'distance or progression (to another step in the argument);' from which the *derivative* meaning, that at the advanced point at which we have arrived, our present view is different to our antecedent one, can easily be deduced; see esp. Donalds, *Crat.* § 192. That this however is the normal and *primary* idea of the particle (see Hartung, *Partik.* *ἄρα*, I. 3, Vol. I. p. 422) cannot now be maintained; see Klotz, *Devar.* Vol. II. p. 160 sq., where the whole question is discussed at great length. According to this writer, *ἄρα* involves 'significationem levioris cuiusdam ratiocinationis, quae indicat *rebus ita comparatis* aliiquid ita aut esse aut fieri,' in *Devar.* p. 167. The interrogatory form (*ἄρα*) as adopted by Syr., Ust., al. seems here less forcible and appropriate.

τὸ σκάνδαλον τοῦ σταυροῦ] 'the of-

fence of the cross,' 'offendiculum crucis,' Beza; the offence which the Jews took at Christianity, because faith in a crucified Saviour, faith without legal observances, was *alone* offered as the means of salvation; οὐδὲ γὰρ οὕτως ὁ σταυρὸς ἡν σκανδαλίζων τὸν Ἰουδαίον ὡς τὸ μὴ δεῖν πειθεσθαι τοὺς πατρῷοις ἕλμοις Chrys.; comp. 1 Cor. i. 18, &c. see Brown, *Galat.* p. 278, and Usteri, *Lehrb.* II. 2. 1, p. 253. *Σκάνδαλον*, though occurring (quotations included) 15 times in the N. T., and 20 times in the LXX and Apocrypha, is scarcely ever found 'apud profanos.' *Σκανδαληθρος* (τὸ ἐνστριμενὸν τὰς μυδηρας, Poll. *Onomast.* I. 34) occasionally occurs; e. g. in a metaphorical sense, Aristoph. *Acharn.* 687.

12. ὅφελον] 'I would that,' indignant wish called forth by the last deduction, and by the thought of the antagonism of circumcision to the cross of Christ; see Ewald in loc., and comp. ch. ii. 21. This word is used *purely* as a particle, both in the N. T. (see 1 Cor. iv. 8, 2 Cor. xi. 1), and in the LXX, e. g. Exod. xvi. 3, Numb. xiv. 2, xx. 3, Psalm cxix. 5; see Winer, *Gr.* § 41. 5. 2, p. 270, and Sturz, *de Dialect. Maced.* s. v. § 12. Its construction therefore here with a future, though unusual and (appy. according to Lucian, *Soloe.* 1) solecistic, need not have caused Bengel to alter the punctuation (τὸ σκάνδαλον τοῦ σταυροῦ ὅφελον.), and to connect *ὅφελον* as a kind of exclamation ('velim ita sit!') with what precedes. On the similar use of *ὤφελος* and *ὤφελε* in later writers, compare Matth. *Gr.* § 513. obs. 3; and on the correct and classical use ('ὤφελον non nisi tum adhiberi quum quis optat ut fuerit aliiquid, vel sit, vel futurum sit, quod non fuit,

13

Ὑμεῖς γὰρ ἐπ' ἑλευθερίᾳ ἐκλήθητε, Do not misuse your
freedom, but love
one another. Love is the fulfilment of
the law; hatred brings destruction.

aut est, aut futurum est'), see Herm. Viger, No. 190. καὶ διοκόφονται] 'they would even cut themselves off (from you).' The exact meaning of these words has been much discussed. The usual passive translation ('abscindantur,' Vulg., Goth., appy. Syr. [Schaaf], Εθ.-Platt, Arm.) cannot be defended, as the N. T. furnishes no certain instance of a similar enallage. The most plausible is 1 Cor. x. 2, καὶ πάντες ἐβαπτίσαντο, but even here the middle voice (sc. 'baptismum suscepunt,' Beng.) may be correctly maintained; see Winer, Gr. § 38. 4, p. 228, and exx. in Jelf, Gr. § 364. 4. a. We have thus only two possible translations, (a) 'I would that they would even cut themselves off (plane discedant) from communion with you,' Bretschn.; or (β) 'I would that they would (not only circumcise, but) even castrate themselves;' μὴ τερπεῖσθωσαν μάνον, δλλὰ καὶ διοκέσθωσαν Chrys.; διοκέσθωσαν έναρτος έτοιχαν' Ecum.: see exx. in Wetst. in loc. This latter reference to bodily mutilation is adopted by the principal patristic expositors, as well as by most modern writers; and it must be admitted that thus not only καὶ is more readily explained, and the expression of the wish (δεῖθεν) more easily accounted for, but that there is also a species of parallelism in the use of καταγομένων, Phil. iii. 2. Still as there seems no certain trace of this corporeal reference in any of the ancient Vv.,—as in some (Εθ.-Platt, and perhaps Arm.) the reference seems plainly ethical,—as there is a seeming contrast in the καλέσιν ἐπὶ of the confirmatory clause which follows, and as this seems alone suited to the earnest gravity with which St Paul is here addressing his

converts, we adopt somewhat unhesitatingly the former interpretation.

The Apostle's deep insight into the exact spiritual state of the Galatians, and the true affection that throughout the Epistle tempers even his necessary severity, leads him here to express as a wish what he might (as in 1 Cor. v. 11) have urged as a command: comp. Waterl. Works, Vol. III. p. 458.

οἱ διαστατ. υμᾶς] 'they who are unsettling you,' Hamm., sc. 'your subverters;' the participle with its case becoming by means of the article a kind of substantive; see notes and reff. on ch. i. 23. The verb διαστατῶν (Hesych. διατρέψειν) occurs three times in the N. T. (Acts xvii. 6, xxi. 38) as an equivalent of the more usual ἀδιστατῶν ποιεῖν, but is of rare occurrence (Wetst. on Acts xvii. 6), and is said to belong to that somewhat numerous class of words (Tittm. Synon. p. 266) which are referred to the Macedonian dialect; see Sturz, de Dial. Maced. § 9, p. 146. It has a stronger meaning than ταράσσω, and is admirably paraphrased by Chrys., ἀπὸ τῆς ἀνω' Ἱερουσαλήμ καὶ τῆς ἑλευθέρας ἐκβαλόντες, βιαζόμενοι δὲ καθάπερ αἰχμαλώτους καὶ μεταστὰς πλανάσθαι.

13. ὑμές γάρ] 'For ye,' commencement of a new paragraph, and according to Olsh., De W., al., of a new portion (the hortatory) of the Epistle; ἔτταῦθα λοιπὸν δοκεῖ μὲν εἰς τὸν ηθικὸν ἐμβαλεῖν λόγον' Chrys. St Paul knew so well the human heart, its tendencies and temptations, and saw so clearly how his own doctrine of Christian liberty might be perverted and adulterated, that he at once hastens, with more than usual earnestness, to trace out the ineffaceable distinctions between true spiritual freedom, and a carnal

ἀδελφοί· μόνον μὴ τὴν ἐλευθερίαν εἰς ἀφορμὴν τῇ σαρκὶ, ἀλλὰ διὰ τῆς ἀγάπης δουλεύετε ἀλλήλοις. ὁ γὰρ 14 πᾶς νόμος ἐν ἐνὶ λόγῳ πεπλήρωται, ἐν τῷ Ἀγαπήσεις

and antinomian licence. There is however no marked or abrupt division, but one portion of the epistle passes insensibly into the other. γάρ is thus not illative (Turner), nor a mere particle of transition (Brown), but stands in immediate connexion with the preceding words, which it serves to confirm and justify; ‘and I may well wish that they would cut themselves off from your communion, for ye were called to a state with which they have nothing in common.’ The reading δέ, found in FG; 80; Chrys., Aug., al., seems a very palpable correction. ἐν' Ἰλευθερίᾳ] ‘for freedom;’ ἐν here denoting the purpose or object for which they were called; comp. 1 Thess. iv. 7, οὐ γάρ ἐκάλεσαν ὑμᾶς δὲ Θεός ἐντὸς ἀκαθαρσίᾳ where see notes in loc. Further exx. will be found in Winer, Gr. § 48. c, p. 351, and in Rost u. Palm, Lex. s. v. II. 2. f, Vol. I. p. 1040.

μὴ τὴν Ἰλευθερίαν] ‘make not your liberty;’ scil. ποιέειν, τρέψειν [not however used in N. T.], δωτε (FG; Aug., Boern., al.), or some similar verb. Instances of this very intelligible and idiomatic omission of the verb after μὴ are cited by Hartung, Partik. μὴ, 6. b. 4, Vol. II. p. 153; Klotz, Devar. Vol. II. p. 669; Winer, Gr. § 64. I. 6, p. 526: comp. Hor. Epist. I. 5. 12, ‘Quo mihi fortunam, si non conceditur uti?’ Such ellipses must of course be common in every cultivated language. Σιδὲ τῆς ἀγάπης] ‘by the love ye evince,’ ‘by your love;’ not ‘in your love’ (Peile) with any reference to state or condition (comp. Rom. iv. 11, διὰ δραμαντίας: viii. 25, δι' ὑπομονῆς: al.; Winer, Gr. § 47. i. p. 339); but simply ‘per charitatem,’ Vulg., Ar-

men. [Instrumental case], Copt.; love was to be the means by which their reciprocal δουλεία was to be shown.

The reading τῇ ἀγάπῃ τοῦ Πνεύματος, found in DEFG; 31; Clarom., Sang., Boern., Goth., Copt. [Wilk., but not Böttich.]; Bas., al., is an addition suggested by the preceding σαρκὶ. δουλεύετε] ‘be in bondage,’ ‘servite,’ Vulg., Clarom.; in antithesis to the preceding ἐλευθερίαν οὐκ εἰπεῖς ἀγαπάτε δλλήλους δικλῶς, δλλὰ δουλεύετε, τὴν ἐπιτεταμένην δηλῶν φύλακαν’ Chrys.

14. ὁ γὰρ πᾶς νόμος] ‘For the whole law;’ confirmation from Scripture of the command immediately preceding, διὰ τῆς ἀγάπης κ. τ. λ. A few instances of this order occur in the N. T.; see Middl. Greek Art. ch. VII. p. 104, note, where Rose cites Acts xx. 18, 1 Tim. i. 16 (ἀπασαν), Acts xix. 7 (plural); add xxvii. 37.

ἐν διὶ λόγῳ] ‘in one word,’ scil. in one declaration or commandment:

comp. Rom. xiii. 9.

πεπλήρωται] ‘hath been (and is) fulfilled.’ This reading is supported no less by external evidence [ABCN; 6 mas.; Marc. in Epiph., Damasc. (2), Aug.] than by internal probability. While πληροῦται (*Rec.*) would imply that the process of fulfilment was still going on, the perfect πεπλήρωται suitably points to the completed and permanent act; comp. Rom. xiii. 8, διὰ γαρῶν τὸν ἔτερον νόμον πεπλήρωκεν — a meaning of the perf. which Marcion (according to Tertull. *adv. Marc.* v. 4) appears, either ignorantly or wilfully, to have misunderstood ‘adimpta est, quasi jam non adimplenda.’ It may be observed that there is no discrepancy between this passage and Matth. xxii. 38, Mark xii. 29; for, as

15 τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν εἰ δὲ ἀλλήλους δάκνετε καὶ κατεσθίετε, βλέπετε μὴ ὑπὸ ἀλλήλων ἀναλωθῆτε.

16 Λέγω δέ, Πνεύματι περιπατεῖτε καὶ Walk according to the Spirit, whose fruits no law condemns; and not according to the flesh, the works of which exclude from the kingdom of God.

14. *σεαυτόν*] *Tisch.* (ed. 2) here adopted the more difficult, though not wholly unusual reading *έαυτόν* (see Winer, *Gr.* § 22. 5), but has now rightly returned to the reading of his first edition. *Σεαυτόν* is supported by ABCDE KN; very many mss.; Marc. ap. Ep'ph., Theodoret, Dam. (*Rec.*, *Griesb.*, *Scholz*, *Tisch.* ed. 1, *Lachm.*). *Έαυτόν* appears only in FGL; appy. the majority of mss.; Theophyl., *Ecum.*, (*Mey.*). Usteri very plausibly suggests the falling away of one of the contiguous sigmas in the course of transcription.

Meyer observes, St Paul here takes a lofty spiritual eminence, from which, as it were, he sees all other commands so subordinate to the law of love, that he cannot consider the man who has fulfilled this in any other light than as having fulfilled the whole law: comp. Usteri, *Lehrb.* II. I. 4, p. 242, and Reuss, *Théol. Chrét.* IV. 19, Vol. II. p. 204 sq. The explanation of Vorstius and others, *πληροῦσθαι = διακεφαλαιοῦσθαι*, Rom. xiii. 9, here falls far short of the full spiritual meaning of the passage, and also is at variance with the regular meaning of *πληρ.* in the N. T.; see Matth. iii. 15, Rom. viii. 4, xiii. 8, Col. iv. 17. *διαπήσας*] ‘Thou shalt love.’ The use of the imperative future appears in the N. T. under three forms; (a) as a mild imperative, in simple prohibition, comp. Matth. vi. 5, οὐκ ἔτεσθε ὡς οἱ ὑποκριταί’ (b) as a strong imperative, including prohibition and reproof, comp. Acts xiii. 10, οὐ πανταγ
διαστρέψων τὰς δόδος *Kyplov*; (c) as a legislative imperative,—both negatively (Matth. v. 21, Rom. vii. 7, al.), and positively, as here and Rom. xiii. 9. The two former usages (which in fact may be considered as one, varied only by the tone of the speaker) are common in classical Greek, see Jelf, *Gr.* § 413. 1, 2; Bernh. *Synt.* x. 5, p. 378:

the latter seems distinctly Hebraistic; comp. Gayler, *Part. Neg.* II. 3. 3, p. 75, and Winer, *Gr.* § 43. 5, p. 282. The uses of the future in the LXX appear to be very varied, and serve to express, negatively, *quod non convenit* (Gen. xx. 9), *quod non potest* (Gen. xxxii. 12: comp. Matth. iv. 4, al.); and positively, *quod licet* (Numb. xxxii. 24), *quod solet* (Deut. ii. 11). These are almost purely Hebraistic: see esp. Thiersch, *de Pentat.* III. § 11 sq.

15. *δάκνετε καὶ κατεσθίετε*] ‘bite and devour.’ οὐ εἶτε δάκνετε μόνον, διπερ ἔστι θυμουμένου, ἀλλὰ καὶ κατεσθίετε, διπερ ἔστι ἐμμένοντος τῇ πονηρᾳ. δὲ μὲν γάρ δάκνων δργῆς ἐπλήρωσε πάθος δὲ κατεσθίων θηρωδίας ἐπχάρτης παρέσχει ἀπόδεξις Chrys. Instances of a similar use of δάκνετε are cited by Kypke, *Obs.* Vol. II. p. 287, and Wetst. *in loc.* *διαλαθῆτε*] ‘be consumed,’ ‘consumamini,’ Vulg., Clarom.: continuation of the metaphor, there being appy. a species of climax in the three verbs δάκνετε, κατεσθίετε, and διαλαθῆτε. The meaning is sufficiently explained by Chrys., ἡ γάρ δάστασις καὶ ἡ μάχη φθοροποιῶν καὶ διαλωτικὸν καὶ τῶν δεχομένων αὐτὴν καὶ εἰσαγόντων.

16. *λέγω δέ*] ‘Now I say.’ The Apostle now reverts to the first portion of the command in ver. 13, μὴ

ἐπιθυμίαν σαρκὸς οὐ μὴ τελέσητε. ἡ γὰρ σὰρξ ἐπιθύ-

τὴν δευθερίαν εἰς ἀφορᾶν τὴν σάρκα.
 Πνεύματι] 'by the Spirit,' not exactly 'in (*khen*) the Spirit,' Copt., still less 'Spiritui vitam consecrate' (dat. *commodi*; Fritz, *Rom.* Vol. I. p. 225), but simply 'Spiritu,' Vulg., Clarom., —the dative being here what is called the dat. *normæ*, and indicating the metaphorical path, manner, or rule of the action; comp. ch. vi. 16, *Acts* xv. 1, *Phil.* iii. 16: and see Hartung, *Carus*, p. 79; Winer, *Gr.* § 31. 6. b, p. 193; Bernh. *Synt.* III. 14, p. 102; and exx. collected by Fritz, *Rom.* xiii. 13, Vol. III. p. 142. It is necessary to observe that Πνεύματι is not 'after a heavenly or spiritual manner,' Peile (*κατὰ τὰς πνευματικὰς ἔνορδας*, Schol. ap. Matth.),—a very insufficient paraphrase, nor even, 'in accordance with indwelling grace' (*πνεῦμα δὲ τὴν ἐνουκούσαν χάριν, αὕτη γὰρ ἐπὶ τὰ κρείττω ποδηγεῖ τὴν ψυχήν* Theod.), as all such glosses tend to obscure the true nature of the contrast between Πνεύμα and σάρξ. Whenever these two words stand thus opposed, it has been satisfactorily shown by Müller (*Doctr. of Sin*, Vol. I. p. 354 sq., Clark) that the Πνεύμα is not either the spiritual part of man (das Geistige), or the human spirit, if even always strengthened by the Holy Spirit,—the 'divinized spiritual' (das Geistliche; comp. Reuss, *Theol. Chrét.* Vol. II. p. 54), but the Holy Spirit itself, in so far as it is conceived to be the governing principle in man, the active and animating principle of Christian life, the Πνεύμα τῆς ζωῆς ἐν Χρ. Ἰησ., *Rom.* viii. 2, the Πν. Χριστοῦ, Πν. Θεοῦ, *ib. ver.* 9: see also Neander, *Planting*, Vol. I. p. 467 (Bohn), and esp. Höfmann, *Schrifb.* Vol. I. p. 254 sq. On the omission of the article, see notes on ver. 5; and on the meaning of *περιττατεῖν* as

implying life in its regular and practical manifestations, see notes on *Phil.* iii. 18, and on *I Thess.* iv. 12.
 ἐπιθυμίαν σάρκες] 'the desire of the flesh;' scil. all the motions and desires of the merely natural man, all that tends to earth and earthliness. The meaning of σάρξ in this important and deeply suggestive passage deserves the reader's careful consideration. The context seems clearly to show that here, as in many other passages in the N. T., σάρξ is not merely the carnal as opposed to the spiritual, i. e. the purely sensational part of man, but comprehends in a more general notion the whole 'life and movement of man in the world of sense' (Müller), or perhaps, to speak a little more precisely, the 'whole principle and realm of earthliness and earthly relations' (σάρκα ἐ-ταῦθα τὸν λογισμὸν καλεῖ τὸν γεώδην Chrys.); selfishness, as Müller has well observed, ever appearing in the background. The transition from this to the more definitely ethical notions of weakness, sin, and sensationalism, which Müller has too much lost sight of (see notes on *Col.* ii. 11), is thus easy and natural: see esp. the good article of Tholuck, *Stud. u. Krit.* for 1855, p. 485—488; Müller, *Doctr. of Sin*, Vol. I. p. 350 sq. (Clark); and comp. Beck, *Seelenl.* II. 18, p. 53; Dilitzsch, *Bibl. Psychol.* v. 6, p. 325 sq.

οὐ μὴ τελέσητε] 'ye shall not accomplish,' 'non perficietis,' Vulg., Clarom.; comp. Matth. x. 23, οὐ μὴ τελέσητε τὰς πόλεις. This clause may be translated either (a) imperatively, καὶ being the simple copula joining two imperative clauses, the first expressed affirmatively, the second negatively (Copt., Arm., *Aeth.*, and more recently Hamm., Mey., al.); or (b) as a future, in which case καὶ

μεὶς κατὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος, τὸ δὲ Πνεῦμα κατὰ τῆς σαρκός· ταῦτα γὰρ ἀλλήλοις ἀντίκειται, ἵνα μὴ ἀνθέλητε

17. *ταῦτα γὰρ*] So *Lach.* and *Tisch.* (ed. 1), with BD¹EFGN; 17; Vulg., Clarom., Copt., Arm.; Latin Ff. (*Mey.*, *Alf.*, *Bagge*),—and appy. correctly, as δέ, though strongly supported, viz. by ACD³KL; nearly all mss.; Syr. (both), *Æth.* (both); Chrys., Theodore, Dam., al. (*Rec.*, *Griesb.*, *Scholz*, *Tisch.* ed. 2, 7) is much more likely to have been a change from γὰρ to avoid the seeming awkwardness of a repetition of the particle, than vice versa. There is also some weight in the internal evidence; the repetition of γὰρ being so well-known a characteristic of the Apostle's style.

will be consecutive, and nearly equiv. to ‘ita fiet ut;’ comp. notes on *Phil.* iv. 12. Of these (a) is perfectly admissible on grammatical grounds; for the general principle—that *οὐ μὴ* with the 2nd pers. fut. is *prohibitive*, and that with the other persons of the future and all persons of the subj. it enounces a *negation*, and not a prohibition (*Hermann on Elmsl. Med.* 1120, p. 391)—includes so many scarcely doubtful exceptions even in classical Greek (see exx. in *Gayler, Partic. Neg.* p. 435), that it may be sometimes doubted whether the first negative both in *οὐ μὴ* and *μὴ οὐ* may not really be ‘oratorium magis quam logicum’ (*Gayler*). Be this as it may, it seems certain that in later Greek, and esp. in the LXX, this use of *οὐ μὴ* in nearly all combinations, but esp. with subj., is so very abundant (see exx. in *Gayler*, p. 440), that no grammatical objections (opp. to *Bloomf.*) can be urged against the *prohibitive* usage. As however there is no distinct instance of such a construction in the N.T., and still more as the next verses seem more naturally to supply the reasons for the assertion than for the command, it seems best with Vulg., Clarom., Syr., and appy. Goth. (see *De Gabel. Gr. Gotk.* § 182. I. b. 3) to adopt the *future* translation. On the use of the subj. aor. for the

future in negative enunciations, see notes and ref. on ch. iv. 30; and on the subject of the verse as limited to religious contentions, see 2 sermons by *Howe, Works*, Vol. III. p. 123 sq. (ed. *Hewlett*).

17. *ἢ γὰρ σὰρξ κατὰ λ.*] ‘For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit;’ reason for the foregoing declaration that walking after the Spirit will preclude the fulfilling the lusts of the flesh; ‘merito hoc addit cum in uno et eodem homine regenerato sit caro et Spiritus: cuius certamen copiosissime explicatur, Rom. vii. [15—20].’ *Beza*. In the following words the order *ἀντίκειται γάλληλοις* [*Rec.* with KLN; mss.; Ff.] is rightly reversed with greatly preponderating authority.

Ἐν μή] ‘to the end that ye may not,’ not ‘so that ye cannot do,’ *Auth.* (*οὐκ ἐπὶ αἰτίας εἶπεν, διλλ' ὡς ἀκόλουθος κατὰ τὸ οἰκεῖον λέγειν*—*Theod.*), but with the usual and proper telic force of *ἐν*, ‘ut non quaecumque vultus illa (ista, Cl.) faciat’; Vulg., Clarom., comp. *Goth.*, *Æth.*: the object and end of the *τὸν ἀντικεῖσθαι* on the part of each Principle is to prevent a man doing what the other Principle would lead him to; ‘τὸ Πνεῦμα impedit vos quo minus perficiatis τὰ τῆς σαρκός, contra ἢ σὰρξ adversatur vobis ubi τὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος peragere studetis.’ *Winer*; see *Fritz. Excurs. in Matth.*

ταῦτα ποιῆτε. εἰ δὲ Πνεύματι ἀγεοθε, οὐκ ἔστε ὑπὸ 18

p. 838; Baur, *Paulus*, p. 533 sq.; and comp. the very good remarks of Hammond, *Serm. VII. Part I.* p. 123 (Angl.-Cath. Libr.), where, although he quotes the eventual (ecbatic) sense of *τι* in translation he almost appears to adopt the final sense in his remarks and deductions. On the use of *τι* in the N. T., see notes on *Eph. I. 17*; Fritz, *Excurs. l.c.*; and Winer, *Gr. § 53. 6*, p. 406: and for a notice and example of its secondary-telic, or sub-final use, notes on *I Thess. V. 4*. Neither this derivative sense however, nor any assumed eventual force (opp. to Ust. and De W.), is here to be ascribed to the particle, both being appy. inconsistent with the probable meaning of *θέλητε*: see next note.

διὸ διάθητε] ‘whosoever ye may wish.’ This latter clause will admit of three different explanations according as *θέλητε* is referred to (a) the carnal will, John viii. 44, I Tim. v. 11; (b) the moral or better will; or (c) the free-will in its ordinary acceptation. Of these explanations, the first (a), though supported both by Chrys., Theod., and several distinguished modern expositors (Bull, *Harm. Ap. II. 9. 25* sq.; Neander, *Planting*, Vol. I. p. 468, ed. Bohn), must still be pronounced logically inconsistent with *ταῦτα γὰρ δὲ λ. δυτίκ.*, which seems rather to point to the opposition incurred than the victory gained by the Spirit. The second (b), though perhaps in a less degree, is open to the same objection, notwithstanding the support it may be thought to receive from Rom. vii. 15 sq., where *θέλω* seems to point to the imperfect though better will; see Calv., Schott, De W., who conceive that St Paul is here expressing briefly what in Rom. l.c. he is stating more at length. The simple

and logical connexion of the words however is much better supported by (c), subject only to this necessary and obvious limitation, that this *τοῦ πνεύματος μάχη* must be only predicated in its full extent of the earlier and more imperfect stages of a Christian course; see Olsh. *in loc.* The state of the true believer is conflict, but with final victory; a truth that was felt even by the Jews, among whom Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and more especially Joseph, were ever cited as instances of a victorious issue: Schoettg. *de Lucta Carnis et Spiritus*, III. 10, 11 (Vol. I. p. 1204).

18. *εἰ δὲ κ.τ.λ.*] ‘But if ye be led by the Spirit,’ contrasted state to the struggle described in the preceding verse; ‘ubi vero Sp. vincit, acie res decernatur:’ Beng. When the Spirit becomes truly the leading and guiding principle, then indeed the doubtful struggle has ceased; there would be no fulfilling of the works of the flesh, and by consequence no longer any bondage to the law; comp. Maurice, *Unity of N. T.* p. 510, and Baur, *Paulus*, p. 534 note.

Πνεύματι δύοθε] ‘by the Spirit,’ instrumental dative; comp. 2 Tim. iii. 6, *δύομεν ἐπιθυμίαις ποικίλαις* and see Winer, *Gr. § 31. 7*, p. 194, and exx. collected by Kypke, *Obs. Vol. II.* p. 172. Who can doubt, says Müller (*Doctr. of Sin*, Vol. I. p. 355, Clark), that *Πν. δύοθ.* here entirely corresponds in the mind of the Apostle with Rom. viii. 14, *Πνεύματι Θεοῦ δύονται*, and that thus the fuller and deeper meaning of *Πνεύμα* must be maintained throughout this paragraph? *οὐκ δοῦτε ὑπὸ νόμου*] ‘ye are not under the law;’—not, on the one hand, because there is now no need of its beneficial influences (*οὐ δεῖται τῆς ἡπό-*

19 νόμον. φανερὰ δέ ἐστιν τὰ ἔργα τῆς σαρκός, ἄτινά
20 ἐστιν πορνεία, ἀκαθαρσία, ἀσέλγεια, εἰδωλολατρεία,

τοῦ νόμου βοηθειάς Chrys., al.), nor, on the other, because it is now become an alien principle (Usteri, *Lehrb.* I. 4. A, p. 57); but simply, ‘because it finds nothing in you to forbid or to condemn,’ see ver. 23. The more obvious conclusion might have seemed, ‘ye are not under the influences of the flesh;’ but as the law was confessedly the principle which was ordained against the influences and ἔργα τῆς σαρκός (Rom. vii. 7 sq.), the Apostle (in accordance with the general direction of his argument) draws his conclusion relatively rather to the principle, than to the mere state and influences against which that principle was ordained.

19. φανερὰ δέ] ‘But, to explain and substantiate more fully the last assertion οὐκ ἐστὲ ὑπὸ νόμου, the open difference between the works of the flesh, against which the law is ordained, and the fruit of the Spirit, against which there is no law, shall now be manifested by special examples.’ ἄτινά ἐστιν] ‘of which class are;’ not quite so much as ‘quippe quae,’ De Wette, ‘quæ quidem,’ Schott,—but merely ‘such for instance as,’ δοτοις having appy. here its *classifying* force; see notes on ch. iv. 24.

τορνεῖα] ‘fornication.’ Observe the prominence always given to condemnations of this deadly sin, it being one of the things which the old pagan world deemed as merely διδόποια. see Meyer on *Acts* xv. 20. The insertion of μορχεῖα [Rec. with DE(FG εια)KL; Clarom., Goth., Syr.-Phil.; Gr. and Lat. Ff.] and the change to plurals [FG; Orig., al.] are rightly rejected by the best recent editors with ABCN; 3 mas., Vulg., Syr., Copt., Æth. (both); Clem.,

Marc. in Epiph.; Cyr., al. ἀκαθαρσία, ἀσέλγεια] ‘uncleanness, wantonness;’ comp. Rom. xiii. 13, 2 Cor. xii. 21 (where the same three words are in connexion), Eph. iv. 19. The distinction between these words is drawn by Tittmann, *Synonym.* p. 151,—ἀκαθ. (more generic), ‘quilibet vitæ animique impuritas;’ ἀσέλγ., ‘protervitias et impudens petulantia hominis ἀσέλγοῦς qui nullam verecundiam pudorisque rationem habet, non obscenitas aut feditas lubidinis;’ comp. *Etym. Mag.*, ἀσέλγεια· ἔτουμβης πρὸς τάνα τὸντινον· and by Trench, *Synon.* § 16, where this latter word is defined as ‘petulance or wanton insolence,’ and as somewhat stronger than ‘protervitas,’ and more nearly approaching ‘petulantia.’ The derivation is very doubtful: it does not seem from θελγεῖν (Trench), but perhaps from ἀσ. (satiety) and ελγ. connected with δλγ. (Benfey, *Wurzellex.* Vol. II. p. 15), or more probably (Donalds.) from a priv. and σαλαγή· [σαλαγέω, σέλας], the primary idea being ‘dirtiness,’ ‘foulness.’ Winer observes that the vices here enumerated may be grouped into four classes; (1) *sensuality*; (2) *idolatry*, not merely spiritual, but actual,—amalgamation of Christianity and heathenism (1 Cor. viii. 7); comp. Neander, *Planting*, Vol. I. p. 243 note (Bohn); (3) *malice*; (4) *excesses*. Bengel similarly divides them as ‘peccata commissa cum proximo, adversus Deum, adversus proximum, et circa se ipsum; cui ordini respondet enumeratio fructus Spiritus.’ There does not however appear any studied precision in the classification: St Paul, as Aquinas remarks, ‘non intendit enumerare omnia vitia ordinata et secun-

φαρμακεία, ἔχθραι, ἔρις, ζῆλος, θυμοί, ἐριθεῖαι, διχοστα-

dum artem, sed illa tantum in quibus abundant et in quibus excedunt illi ad quos scribit.'

20. φαρμακεία [sorcery,]
[magia] Syr.

This word, like the Lat. 'veneficia' (Vulg., Clarom.), may either imply (a) *poisoning*, as *Aeth.*, perhaps Goth., 'lubjaleisel' [comp. Angl. Sax. *lub*], al.; or (β) *sorcery*, as Syr. (both), Copt. (appy.), Arm., al. The former is not improbable on account of its juxtaposition to *ἔχθραι* (see exx. in Schleusn. *Lex. in LXX.* s.v., Exod. vii. 11, al.); the latter however seems here more probable, sorcery, as Meyer notices, being especially prevalent in Asia; see Acts xix. 19. On the subject generally, see Delitzsch, *Bibl. Psychol.* IV. 17, p. 262 sq. Both in this and the following words there is much variation between the sing. and plural forms. *Rec.* commences the list of plurals with *ἔχθραι* the singulars *ἔρις* [ABD¹Ν; mss.] and *ζῆλος* [(A latet) BD¹E(FG ζῆλος); 17. Goth.] seem however to have the critical preponderance, and are adopted by *Lachm.*, *Tisch.* and most modern editors.

θυμός [‘displaye of wrath;’ both this and the associated plurals serving to denote the various concrete forms of the abstract sins here specified: see exx. of *θυμοί* noticed by Lobeck, *Ajax*, 716; Bernhardy, *Synt.* II. 6, p. 62; and esp. the good note of Heinichen on Euseb. *Eccl. Hist.* VIII. 6, Vol. III. p. 18 sq. The meaning of *θυμός*, as its derivation implies [*θύω*, perhaps connected with Sanscr. *dhu*, ‘agitate,’ Pott, *Eym. Forsch.* Vol. I. p. 211], is not so much ‘inimicitia hominis acerbi et iracundi’ (Tittm. *Synon.* p. 133), as *iracundia*, or rather *excandescencia*, the principal idea be-

ing that of ‘eager motion towards, impulse;’ see esp. Donalds. *Crat.* § 473,—where however the derivation of *θύω* is plausibly referred to ΘΕ-, on the principle of ‘suggestion by contrast.’ It thus differs from *δρῦψη*, both in its *rise*, as more sudden (Luke iv. 28, Acts xix. 28), and its *nature*, as less lasting (compare *Eccl. xlvi. 10, κονάσαι δρῦψην πρὸ θυμοῦ*): see Trench, *Synon.* § 37; Fritz *Rom.* Vol. I. p. 105; and notes on *Eph.* iv. 31. *ἐριθεῖαι*

[caballings;’ comp. Syr., *ئەنەنە*]

[rebellio, calumnia]. The accurate meaning of the word *ἐριθεῖα* appears to have been missed by most of the older, and indeed most of the modern expositors, by whom it is commonly connected with *ἔρις* (comp. *Ecum.*), and understood to mean ‘contention;’ comp. ‘*rixæ*’ Vulg., ‘*irritationes*’ Clarom. Its true etymological connexion is however with the Homeric word *ἔριος*, ‘a day-labourer,’ and thence either with *ἔριος* (*τὴν ἔργαζομένην τὰ ἔρια*, Phavor. *Eclog.* p. 201, ed. Dind.), or more probably with “*ἘΡΩ*, *ἔρδω*, *ἔρεθω*, comp. Lobeck, *Patholog.* p. 365. Its meaning then is (a) *Labour for hire*; comp. Suidas, s.v. *δεκτήσθας*; (β) *Scheming or intriguing for office*, ‘ambitus;’ comp. Aristot. *Pol.* V. 2, 3, p. 1302 (ed. Bekk.); (γ) *Party-spirit*, a contentious spirit of faction; comp. Schol. ap. Matth. *ἔριθ*. *ἔρφιλόνεικοι πρᾶξεις*, and Steph. *Thes.* s. v., where there are also traces of a right perception of the true meaning. Of these (γ) seems to be the prevailing meaning in the N. T., where *ἔριθ* occurs no less than 7 times, and in the following combinations: in Rom. ii. 8, of *ἔριθ*. are coupled with *οἱ διπεθοῦντες τὴν ἀληθεῖαν*,

21 σίαι, αἱρέσεις, φθόνοι, φόνοι, μέθαι, κῶμοι, καὶ τὰ δημοια τούτοις ἀ προλέγω ὑμῖν, καθὼς καὶ προεἶπον, ὅτι οἱ

21. φόνοι] Omitted by *Tisch.* with BN; 17. 33. 35. 57. 73; Demid., Aug.*; Clem., Marcion ap. Epiph., Iren.; Cypr., Hieron. (distinctly), Ambrst., Aug. ([*Lachm.*], approved by *Mill.*). The authorities for the text are ACDEFGKL; great majority of mss.; Clarom., Boern., Vulg., Syr. (both), Copt., al.; Chrys., Theod., al. (*Rec.*, *Griesb.*, *Scholz*, *Mey.*, *Alf.*, *Bagge*). These so decidedly preponderate, the characteristic paronomasia is so probable, and the omission in transcription owing to the similarity in words so very likely, that we do not hesitate to restore φόνοι.

and are opposed to οἱ καθ' ὑπομονὴν ἔργου δγεθοῦ in 2 Cor. xii. 20, ἐριθεῖαι are enumerated between θυμοὶ and καταλαλιαι in Phil. i. 16, 17, ἐρθ. is in antithesis to δγεθη̄ ib. ii. 3, it is connected with κενοδοξίᾳ, and in James iii. 14, 16, with ξῆλος. In Ignat. *Philad.* 8, ἐρθ. is opposed to χριστομαθίᾳ. It would thus seem that in all these passages, with the exception perhaps of Rom. l.c. and Phil. l.c.—where the context points less to party-spirit than to the contentiousness it excites (see notes on *Phil.* i. 17, *Transl.*)—the meaning of ἐρθ. is fairly covered by the definition of Fritz, as ‘summa invidia pectore inclusa proclivitasque ad machinationes;’ see Rückert on *Rom.* ii. 8, and esp. Fritz, *Excursus on ἐρθος, ἐρθεῖαι, ἐρθεῖοναι, Comm. on Rom.* Vol. I. p. 143 sq. διχοτομίαι, αἱρέσεις] ‘divisions, parties;’ the ‘standings apart’ (comp. ‘tvisstasseis,’ Goth.) and divisions (Rom. xvi. 17) implied in the former word leading naturally to the more determinate choice (‘electio pressertim discipline cuiusdam,’ Schott) exercised in the formation of the latter; comp. Theoph. and Bagge *in loc.*

21. μέθαι, κῶμοι] ‘drunkennesses, revellings,’ ‘ebrietates, comessationes,’ Vulg., Clarom.; the latter being the more generic and inclusive, to which the former was the usual accompani-

ment. On the nocturnal κῶμοι (τὰ δειλῆγι καὶ πορνικὰ δοματα, συμπόσια· Hesych.) of the ancients, see Schwarz, *de Comiss. Vt.*, Altdorf, 1744; Welcker in Jacobs, *Philostr.* I. 2, p. 202 sq.; and on the derivation of the word [appy. connected with κοιμω, and from a root κι-] Benfey, *Wurzellex.* Vol. II. p. 150. ἀ προλέγω ὑμῖν] ‘about which I tell you beforehand;’ either ‘præmoneo priusquam veniat dies retributionis sive judicii quem hic respicit,’ Est., or more simply, ‘prædico, ante eventum,’ Beng.; comp. 1 Thess. iii. 4. It is not necessary to refer ἀ to πρόσωπον, as an accus. derived by attraction from the accus. *objecti* after that word (Schott, Olsh.); the ordinary explanation, ‘quod attinet ad ea quæ’ (Camerar.), being perfectly satisfactory. In such cases the relative is really governed by the finite verb as a species of ‘quantitative’ accus.; its prominence in the sentence, and appy. absolute use, being designed to call attention to that on which the thought or action principally turns; comp. John viii. 54, and see Scheuerl. *Synt.* § 8. 4. p. 55. Such sentences often involve a slight, but perfectly intelligible, anacoluthon; see Fritz. *Rom.* vi. 10, Vol. I. p. 393, and comp. notes on ch. ii. 20.

καθὼς καὶ προεῖπον] ‘as I also told you before-hand,’ sc. when I was with

τὰ τοιαῦτα πράσσοντες βασιλείαν Θεοῦ οὐ κληρονομήσουσιν. ὁ δὲ καρπὸς τοῦ Πνεύματός ἐστιν ἀγάπη, χαρά, 22 εἰρήνη, μακροθυμία, χρηστότης, ἀγαθωσύνη, πίστις,

you; the *kai* appy. reminding them that these were warnings not new to them. The particle is omitted in BFGN¹ (*καθὼς εἴπω*); Amit., Demid.; Chrys. (1), al., and bracketted by Lachm., but rightly retained as part of the text by most recent editors, the external evidence in its favour [ACD EKLN⁴; nearly all mss., and most Vv.; Clem., Chrys., Theod.] being decidedly preponderant.

τὰ τοιαῦτα] ‘such things as these,’ ‘all such things.’ The article with *τοιούτος* denotes a known person or thing, or the whole class of such, but not an undefined individual out of the class; as in that case *τοιούτος* is anarthrous: see Kühner on Xenoph. *Mem.* I. 5. 2, and Krüger, *Sprachl.* § 50. 4. 6. *βασιλ. Θεοῦ οὐ κληρον.*] ‘shall not inherit the kingdom of God;’ comp. Eph. v. 5, where with equal pertinence the declaration is made of present time. On the meaning of the inclusive term *βασιλεία Θεοῦ*—that kingdom which was completely established at the ascension (see Jackson, *Creed*, II. 45. 2), of which Christ is the founder, and Christ (and God, Rev. xi. 15, xii. 10) the King, and of which the true Christian even while here on earth is a subject,—see esp. Tholuck, *Bergpred.* p. 72 sq.; Bauer, *Comment. Theol.* II. p. 107 sq.; Heemskerk, *Notio τῆς βασ. κ.τ.λ.* (Amst. 1839); and the comments of Reuss, *Theol. Chrét.* II. 4, Vol. I. p. 180 sq. On its distinction (whether ‘in sensu initiali or finali’) from the more collective and, so to say, localized *ἐκκλησία*, see Stier, *Ephes.* Vol. II. p. 252 sq.

22. *καρπός*] ‘fruit;’ used appy. with a significant reference to the

organic development from the root, the Spirit (Olah., Bloomf.); διὰ τὸ δὲ καρπὸν καλέται τοῦ Πνεύματος; διτὶ τὰ μὲν πονηρὰ ἔργα δὲ ἡμῶν γίγνεται μόνον, διὸ καὶ ἔργα καλέσται δὲ καλὰ οὐ τῆς ἡμετέρας ἐπιμελεῖς δέσπαι μόνον, δλλὰ καὶ τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ φιλανθρωπίας. Chrys. It is possible that no marked distinction may be intended (Mey.), still, as *καρπός* is nearly always used by St Paul ‘in bonam partem’ (Rom. i. 13, vi. 22, xv. 28, Eph. v. 9, Phil. i. 11, 22, iv. 17), and as even in Rom. vi. 21, where it is used in ref. to *evil works*, the same meaning (‘what fruit?’ i. e., ‘what really beneficial result had yet?’ &c.) appears to be preserved, we may safely press the peculiar meaning and significance of the term: see an excellent sermon on this text by Sanderson, *Serm. XVII.* (ad Aul.) p. 594 sq. (Lond. 1689). *δύάπη, χαρᾶ*] ‘love, joy,’ *δύάπη*, as Mey. observes, standing at the head, as the moving principle of all the rest (comp. 1 Cor. xiii. 1 sq.); and *χαρᾶ* following, as that special gift of the Spirit (comp. 1 Thess. i. 6) which ought to be the pervading principle of Christian life (Phil. iv. 4); comp. Reuss, *Theol. Chrét.* IV. 18, Vol. II. p. 202.

εἰρήνη] ‘peace,’ not so much *here* in ref. to peace with God (Phil. iv. 7, see notes in loc.), as—in accordance with the associated and partially contrasted terms *εχθραὶ κ.τ.λ.* (ver. 20),—peace with one another; comp. 1 Thess. v. 15. On the meaning of *μακροθυμία* (*clementia, quæ ira temperans delictum non statim vindicet*), Fritz, *Rom. Vol. I.* p. 98), see notes on Eph. iv. 2, and for its distinction from *ὑπομονή*, notes on Col. i. 11. *χρηστότης*,

23 πραῦτης, ἐγκράτεια· κατὰ τῶν ταιούτων οὐκ ἔστιν νόμος.

ἀγαθωσύνη] ‘benevolence, goodness.’ These words are near'y synonymous. Χρηστέτης (defined in [Plato] *Def.* p. 412 E, as ἡθεὸς ἀπλαστα μετ' εὐλογίστας) may perhaps denote that benevolence and sweetness of disposition ('benignity,' Wicl., Rhem.) which finds its sphere and exercise in our intercourse with one another; comp. Tit. iii. 4, where it is joined with φιλανθρωπία, and see Tittm. *Synon.* p. 140; Planck, *Comment. Theol.* Part I. p. 197; and the citation from Jerome in Trench, *Synon.* § 50.

Ἀγαθωσύνη, a somewhat rare word, though occurring in three other places in St Paul's Epp. (Rom. xv. 14, Eph. v. 9, 2 Thess. i. 11), seems more than ἡ ἀπηρτισμένη ἀρετή (Phavorinus, Zonaras), or even than ‘animi ad optima quaeque propensio’ (Gom. on Rom. xv. 14), and may not improbably be extended to that ‘propensio’ as exhibited in *action*, the propensity *both to will and do* what is good; see Stier, *Ephes.* Vol. II. p. 265, and comp. Suicer, *Thes.* Vol. I. p. 16. The idea of ‘bountifulness,’ Nehem. ix. 25, is necessarily included. It may thus be distinguished from the somewhat late word ἀγαθότης (Lob. *Phryn.* p. 350), which rather denotes ‘goodness in its essence,’ and is thus commonly used in reference to God.

πίστις] ‘faith,’ not merely ‘fidelitas, veracitas in promissis’ (Men. ap. Pol. *Syn.*), i. e. ‘good faith’ (Math. xxiii. 23; Tit. ii. 10, πίστις ἀγαθή), but *trustfulness* (Conyb.), faith in God's promises and mercies and loving trust towards men; comp. 1 Cor. xiii. 7, πάντα πιστεύει, where, like μακροθυμία and χρηστότης (ver. 4), it stands as one of the characteristics of ἀγάθη.

23. πραῦτης] ‘Meekness,’ ‘modestia,’ Vulg. The πραῦς is defined by Titt-

mann, *Synon.* p. 140, as ‘mansuetus, qui sequo animo omnia fert (*santimūthig*);’ comp. Aristot. *Eth.* IV. II. This however seems wholly insufficient: the *Christian* grace of πραῦτης is not mere gentleness or ἀταραχία (*rōd* δυσκίνητον εἴναι πρὸς τὰς δρυδὲς Stob. *Floril.* I. 18), but appy. denotes a submissiveness to God *as well as* man, and may be distinguished from ἐπιεικεῖα as having its seat in the inner spirit, while the latter seeks to embody itself in acts; see Trench, *Synon.* § 43, and notes on *Col.* iii. 12. On the orthography πραῦτης (appy. the more Attic form, Phot. *Lex.* p. 386) or πραῦτης, comp. Lobeck, *Phryn.* p. 403.

ἐγκράτεια] ‘temperance,’ the exercise of control over passions and desires; comp. Acts xxiv. 25, 2 Pet. i. 6: ἐγκρ. δὲ ἔστιν ἀρετὴ τοῦ ἐπιθυμητικοῦ καθ' ἣν κατέχουσι τῷ λογισμῷ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας δρυώσας εἰτὶ τὰς φαῦλας ἥδονάς Stob. *Floril.* I. 18. It is distinguished by Diog.-Laert. from σωφροσύνη as implying a control over the *stronger* passions, whereas the latter implies a self-restraint in what is less vehement; ἡ σωφροσύνη ἡρεμαλας ἔχει τὰς ἐπιθυμίας, ἡ δὲ ἐγκράτεια σφοδρᾶς Suid. *Lex.* s. v. Vol. I. p. 1138 (ed. Gaisf.). The addition of ἀγνεία (D¹EFG; Clarom., Vulg. [not Amit., Fuld.]; Bas., al.) is rightly rejected by appy. all editors.

τῶν τοιεύτων] ‘all such things;’ not masc. (Theod.), but as seems much more natural, and is perhaps suggested by the art. (Olsh.), neut. in reference to the preceding virtues; comp. the somewhat parallel passage, Stobæus, *Floril.* I. 18, fin., ἀκολουθεῖ δὲ τῇ ἀρετῇ χρηστότης, ἐπιεικεῖα, εὐγνωμοσύνη, ἐλπίς ἀγαθή, ἔτι δὲ καὶ τὰ τοιεύτα. Brown's argument (p. 307) is certainly not convincing, ‘τοιεύτων not τοιεύ-

οι δὲ τοῦ Χριστοῦ τὴν σάρκα ἐσταύρωσαν σὺν τοῖς πα-

24. τοῦ Χριστοῦ] *Tisch.* adds Ἰησοῦ with ABC(Ν τοῦ Κυρίου Χρ. Ἰησ.) ; mss.; Copt., Sahid., Æth. (both); Cyr. (often), Doroth., Bas., Procop., Dam., al.; Aug. [*Lachm.*]. The external authorities for the omission are DEFGKL (FG add εἶτε, scil. ὥρες); Vulg., Clarom., Syr. (both), Goth., Arm.; Chrys., Theodoret, Pseud-Ath., al.; very many Lat. Ff. (*Rec.*, *Griesb.*, *Scholz*, *Aif.*). Owing to the importance of ABCN, the external evidence may perhaps be considered slightly in favour of the addition; the order however is so unusual (Eph. iii. 1, Col. ii. 6, but in both with var. readings), and external evidence for and against so nearly balanced, that we decide in favour of the shorter reading.

τῶν,—a curious oversight. οὐκ
τοτῷ νόμῳ] ‘there is no (condemnatory) law.’ The explanation *per meiosin*, ‘tantum abest ut iis legis Mosaicae terrores sint metuendi, ut potius Deo sint grati,’ Rosem. (cited by Brown) is not satisfactory. St Paul draws a contrast between the legal judgment under which the former class lay, and the freedom from it which those who are led by the Spirit enjoy; comp. Bull., *Exam. Censuræ*, XVII. 16, where however the masc. interpr. of τοιούτων is adopted.

24. οἱ §4] ‘Now they;’ slightly contrasted application of the whole foregoing particulars to the special case of Christians, δὲ not being simply continuative (Auth.), nor yet resumptive in ref. to ver. 16 (De W.) or to ver. 18 (Beng.), but almost syllogistic, the application to Christians forming a sort of practical ‘propositio minor’ to the foregoing group of verses. The connexion then of the whole paragraph from ver. 16 appears to be as follows; ‘The Spirit and the flesh are contrary to each other; if the flesh prevail, man is given over to all sin, and excluded from the kingdom of God: if the Spirit be the leading principle, man brings forth good fruits, and is free from the curse of the law. Now the distinguishing feature of the true Christian is the crucifixion of the

flesh; consequently, as must be obvious from what has been said, the living in and being led by the Spirit;’ see Rückert in loc.

ταύρωσαν] ‘crucified,’ scil. when they became Christians, and by baptism were united with Christ in His death; comp. Rom. vi. 3. Though this ethical crucifixion is here designated as an act *past* (comp. Rom. vi. 6, δὲ παλαιὸς ἡμῶν ἀνθρώπος συνεταυρώθη), it really is and must be a continuing act as well; comp. Rom. viii. 13. This however the aor. with its usual and proper force leaves unnoticed; it simply specifies, in the form of a general truth, the act as belonging to the past, without affirming or denying any reference to the present: see Fritz, *de Aor. V*, p. 17; notes on 1 Thess. ii. 16; and comp. Soph. *Antig.* 1318 (last line) ἔδιδαξεν, on which Wex remarks, ‘unum exemplum quod aliquando evenierit tanquam norma proponitur:’ see also Schmalfeld, *Synt.* § 60. 2, p. 128. In all such cases the regular reference of the tense to the past may be felt in the kind of summary way in which the action is stated,—the sort of implied dismissal of the subject, and procedure to something fresh; comp. Donalds, *Gr.* § 433. On the vital truth that our crucifixion of the flesh is included and involved in that of Him with whom we are united,

25 θημασιν καὶ ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις. εἰ ζῶμεν Πνεύματι, Πνεύματι καὶ στοιχῶμεν. μὴ γινώμεθα κενόδοξοι, ἀλλήλους προκαλούμενοι, ἀλλήλοις φθονοῦντες.

comp. Usteri, *Lehrb.* II. I. 3, p. 202 sq.; and on the whole verse read the good sermon of South, *Serm. xxiii.* Vol. IV. p. 338 sq. (Lond. 1843).

25. εἰ ζῶμεν Πνεύματι] ‘If we live by the Spirit;’—‘if, as a matter of fact (see notes on ch. i. 9), we live (emphatic) by the efficacy and operation of the Spirit;’ assumption naturally arising from the preceding declaration of crucifixion of the opposing principle, the flesh; ‘enecatā in hominibus Christianis τῇ σάρκι, necesse est in iisdem vivat suamque vim libere exserat τὸ Πνεῦμα’ Schott. The omission here of all illative particles makes the exhortation more forcible and emphatic; comp. 1 Cor. iii. 17. There is some little difficulty in the explanation of the dative Πνεύματi. It is certainly not (a) a dat. of *manner*, scil. ‘spiritually’ Middl.; as thus not only the force of the verse, but the connexion with what precedes, arising from the opposition of the Πνεῦμα and the σάρξ, is completely lost. Nor again (b) is it a dative of *relation*,—‘si vitam nostram ad Spiritum referimus, ad Spiritum etiam dirigamus vitam,’ Fritz. (*Rom. xiii. 13.* Vol. III. p. 142); for though Rom. xiv. 6—8 supplies a somewhat parallel sentiment, the antithesis between the two clauses is thus obviously deprived of all force and pertinence. On the whole then, the ordinary explanation (c) would seem to be most satisfactory, according to which Πνεύματi is to be regarded as a form of the *instrumental* or *ablative* dative (Winer, *Gr.* § 31. 7, p. 194), and here adopted rather than διὰ with the accus. (John vi. 57, comp. Winer, p. 356) as thus forming

a sharper antithesis to the dative which follows,—‘if we live by the Spirit (if the Spirit is our principle of life), by the Spirit let us also walk;’ comp. 2 Cor. iii. 6, τὸ δὲ Πνεῦμα ἡσωπεῖ and see Neand. *Planting*, Vol. I. p. 469 sq. (Bohn). The second Πνεύμαti is obviously the dat. *norma*, scil. κατὰ τὸν ἑκένον νόμον πολιτεύμενοι Chrys.; see notes on ver. 16. Fritz. explains it as a dat. *commodi*, ‘Spiritui vitam consecrate’ (*Rom. iv. 2*, Vol. I. p. 225); but this (on *Rom. xiii. 13*) he appears to have retracted. στοιχῶμεν] ‘let us walk.’ The hortatory imperative is not without some doctrinal significance (Ust.); the Apostle evidently assuming the union and co-existence of the Divine and human powers in the heart of the true Christian; comp. Beck, *Seelenl.* I. 8, p. 20, II. 13, p. 32 sq., and Usteri, *Lehrb.* II. I. 3, p. 218 note. The command is substantially the same as that in ver. 16, except perhaps that στοιχεῖν [στιχ.] may imply a more *studied* following of a prescribed course than the more general περιπατεῖν (notes on *Phil. iii. 18*); comp. Polyb. *Hist. xxviii. 5. 6*, στοιχεῖν τῇ τῆς συγκλήτου προθέσει Dion.-Hal. *Antiq. vi. 65*, στοιχεῖν ταῖς πλεοντι γνώμαις’ and the somewhat unusual expression στοιχεῖν μᾶς γνωστι, Schol. Arist. *Plut.* 773.

26. μὴ γινώμεθα κ.τ.λ.] ‘Let us not become,’ not ‘let us not be,’ Auth. (comp. Syr.), but ‘non efficiamur,’ Vulg., Clarom., ‘vairamma,’ Goth.; there being appy. no less in the verb than in the person an intentional *mildness*, which seems to imply that the sin of *κενόδοξία* had not yet taken root, though the very warning sug-

Ye who are spiritual should bear and forbear: examine yourselves before ye judge others.

'Ἄδελφοί, ἐὰν καὶ προλημφθῆ ἀν- VI.
θρωπος ἐν τινι παραπτώματι, ὑμεῖς οἱ

gests that it was to be expected. The verse thus forms a suitable concluding warning against those particular sins of the Galatians to which the Apostle alluded in ver. 13—15 and at the close of ver. 20, and belongs to chap. v., though it also serves very naturally to connect the doctrinal with the more directly admonitory portion of the Epistle, which begins with the next chapter. A close connexion with chap. vi. (Mey., al.) seems clearly at variance with the introductory δέλφοι (comp. ch. iv. 12), and the change of person.

ἀλλά. προκαλεόμενος] ‘provoking each other;’ scil. εἰς φίλονες καὶ ξεις. Chrys., ‘calling one another out to the field of controversy,’ Brown; see Herodian, *Hist.* vi. 9 (Oxon. 1704). προκαλεῖσθαι τιμᾶς εἰς μάχην’ and simply, Polyb. *Hist.* i. 46. II, προκαλούμενος τοὺς πολεμίους.

The meaning of φθονῶντες has been modified by some commentators ‘withholding out of envy’ (Olah.), ‘hating’ (Brown). This is not necessary; φθονῶν is the correlative act on the part of the weak to the προκαλεῖσθαι on the part of the strong. The strong vauntingly challenged their weaker brethren: the weak could only retaliate with envy. It may be remarked that φθονῶν does not occur elsewhere in N. T.; in James iv. 2, the correct reading is φονεύετε.

CHAPTER VI. I. δέλφοι] ‘Brethren;’ conciliatory mode of address introducing the more directly admonitory portion: ‘late in hoc etiam uno verbo argumentum:’ Beza. ἐὰν καὶ προλημφθῇ] ‘if a man be even surprised or caught;’ προσoccupatus fuerit, Vulg., Clarom., Syr., ‘gafau-

haidan,’ Goth. The verb προλημφθῆ has received several different interpretations, in accordance with the different meanings assigned to πρό. The more strict *temporal* meaning, ‘antea,’ whether referred to the arrival of the Epistle (Grot.), to a recurrence of the offence (Winer), or to the attempt at restoration,—the λαμβάνεσθαι taking place before the καταρτίσθαι (Olah.),—is unsatisfactory, as the emphatic position of προλημφθῆ and the force of καὶ are thus both obscured. The common reference to the *unexpectedness* of the sin (‘notat improvisam occupationem,’ Vorst.; δὲ συαρταγῆ, Chrys.) is also inconsistent with καὶ, as this meaning of πρό would tend to excuse and qualify, whereas καὶ seems to point out an aggravation of the offence. If however πρό be referred to the *power of escape*,—‘be caught before he could escape,’ ‘flagrante delicto,’—not only the intensive force of καὶ, but the emphatic position of προλημφθῆ and the general tenor of the exhortation is fully preserved. This meaning of προλημφθῆ, it must be admitted, is rare, but see exx. in Kypke, *Obs.* Vol. II. p. 289, and esp. Wisdom xvii. 16, προλημφθεῖς, τὴν δυσδιλυκτὸν ἔμενεν ἀνάγκην. On the Alexandrian form προλημφθῆ, see Winer, *Gr.* § 5. 4, p. 46; *Tisch. Prolegom.* p. XLVII; and on the difference between δὲ καὶ and καὶ ἐδει, see note on ch. i. 8; Herm. *Viger.* No. 307; Klotz, *Devar.* Vol. II. p. 519. ἐν τινι παραπτώματι] ‘in any transgression,’ in any particular act of sin, esp. on the side of error, stumbling, or transgression of a command. On the distinction between παραπτώμα (more particular) and διαπτία (more general), see notes on *Eph.* ii. 1.

**πνευματικοὶ καταρτίζετε τὸν τοιοῦτον ἐν πνεύματι πρᾶ̄-
2 τῆτος, σκοπῶν σεαυτόν, μὴ καὶ σὺ πειρασθῆς.** ἀλλή-

νμέσις οἱ πνευματικοὶ] ‘ye the spiritual ones,’ ‘ye that are spiritual.’ The tenor of the exhortation, coupled with the similar distinctions which St Paul seems elsewhere to have recognized in his converts (e.g., 1 Cor. iii. 1), appears in favour of the opinion that the Apostle is here designating not merely those who were *subjectively* πνευματικοί, i.e., who thought themselves such (comp. Windischm.), but those who were *objectively* πνευματικοί, those who had remained true to him and his doctrines; see Olsh. *in loc.* That the teachers are mainly addressed in ver. 1—5, and the hearers and laity in ver. 6—10, is also probable.

καταρτίζετε] ‘restore.’ The technical meaning ἀπὸ τῶν ἔξαρθρημάτων, ‘reponere in artu luxata membra’ (Steph. *Thes.* Vol. IV. p. 1213), adopted by Beza, Bloomf., Brown, al., does not seem to be here alluded to, as examples of the simple ethical sense (*διορθώστε*, Chrysost.) are sufficiently common; comp. Herodot. V. 28, *καταρτίζειν* (*Μίλητον*); Stob. *Floril.* I. 85, *καταρτίζειν* φίλους διαφερομένους’ Greg.-Nazianz. *Orat. xxvi.* Vol. I. p. 443 B, πέθεν οὖν δρέπουαι καταρτίζειν ὑμᾶς, δόξαντο; cited by Dindorf.

πνεύματι πρᾶ̄τητος] ‘the spirit of meekness,’ not merely ‘a meek spirit,’ —a wholly inadmissible dilution of the true meaning of the words,—but a spirit of which the principal constituent (comp. Bernhardy, *Synt.* III. 44, p. 161) or characterizing quality (Scheuerl. *Synt.* § 16. 3, p. 115) is πρᾶ̄της, compare Winer, *Gr.* § 34. 3. b, p. 212. The anarthrous πνεύμα (but after a prep.) refers *ultimately*, as Chrysostom felt, to the Holy Spirit, one of whose especial χαροματα is ‘gentleness,’ see ch. v. 23. This re-

ference however must not be overstated, or expressed by the use of a capital letter; for, as in 1 Cor. iv. 21 (where πν. πρᾶ̄τητος is joined with ἀγάπη), so here πν. seems immediately to refer to the state of the inward spirit as wrought upon by the Holy Spirit, and *ultimately* to the Holy Spirit as the inworking power; comp. Rom. i. 4, πν. ἀγωστῆς viii. 15, πν. υἱοθεατας’ 2 Cor. iv. 13, πν. τῆς πλοτεῶς Eph. i. 17, πν. σοφίας’ in all which cases πν. seems to indicate the Holy Spirit, and the abstract gen. the specific χάρισμα’ see Hamm. *in loc.*, and notes on 2 Tim. i. 7.

σκοπῶν σεαυτόν] ‘looking to thyself,’ temporal cause stating the (proper) concomitants of the action (‘considering all the time thy own case’) or perhaps with a secondary-causal force hinting at the reasons for it: see Krüger, *Sprachl.* § 56. 12. 1; Schmalfeld, *Synt.* § 207; and comp. Donalds. *Gr.* § 615. For instances of the emphatic and individualizing enallage of number, see Bernhardy, *Synt.* XII. 5, p. 421. Lachm. connects this clause with ver. 2, putting a full stop after πνεύμα πρᾶ̄τητος, and a comma after πειρασθῆς, but thereby obviously weakens the whole force and point of the address. The πνευματικοὶ were reminded of their own liability to fall into temptation: why? Surely not to urge them merely *generally* to bear one another’s burdens, but *particularly* to evince their Christian spirit by restoring one who had fallen only after all as they themselves might.

μὴ κ.τ.λ.] ‘lest thou also shouldst be tempted,’ scil. in a like case; subjunctive (‘verentis est ne quid nunc sit, simulque nescire se utrum sit necne significantis;’ Herm. Soph. *Ajax*, 272),

λων τὰ βάρη βαστάζετε, καὶ οὕτως ἀναπληρώσετε τὸν

2. **ἀναπληρώσετε**] *Tisch.* (ed. 2, 7) reads **ἀναπληρώσατε** with ACDEKLN; appy. nearly all mss.; Syr.-Philox., perhaps Goth. [but conjunct. acts both for fut. and imper.; *De Gabel. Gr.* § 182, 186]; Clem., Ath., Chrys., Theodoret, Dam., al. (*Rec., Griesb., Scholz.*) The authorities for the text are BFG; 2 mss.; Vulg., Clarom., Syr., Arm., Copt., Sahid., *AEth.* (both); Theodoret (ms.), Aster., Procl., Marc. erem.; Tert.^{mar.}, Cypr., al. (*Lachm., Tisch.* ed. 1, *Meyer, De Wette*, approved by *Mill, Prolegom.* p. 123). The preponderance of *MSS.* evidence is thus plainly in favour of the imper.; still the testimony of the *Vv.* joined with the extreme probability of a change from the fut. to the imp. (see *Mill, l. c.*) seems sufficient to authorize the rejection of a reading, which on strict grammatical principles may be pronounced *somewhat* suspicious.

and in the *aor.*, in reference to an event still impending; see *Winer, Gr.* § 56. 2, p. 447, and the copious list of exx. of this and similar constructions in *Gayler, Part. Neg.* p. 325.

2. **ἄλληλον τὰ βάρη**] ‘the burdens of ONE ANOTHER;’ the **ἄλληλον**, as Meyer rightly observes, being emphatic, not however with any oblique reference to the burden of the Law (Alf.), but simply in opposition to that selfish feeling which would leave each one to bear his own; contrast the Apostle’s own example, 2 Cor. xi. 29. The meaning of this expressive word must not be too much circumscribed. It seems chosen with inclusive ref. to all forms of weaknesses (**ἀδύτηματα**, Rom. xv. 1), sufferings, and perhaps more especially sins; the purport of the command being φέρειν τὰ τῶν πληγῶν ἔλαττώματα, Chrys., or, with more exactness, ἐπικουφίζειν τὴν ψυχὴν ὑπὸ τῆς τοῦ ἀμαρτήματος συνειδήσεως βεβαρημένην.’ *Theod.-Mops.* p. 129.

βαστάζετε] ‘bear,’ i.e., sustain as a superimposed burden. On the particular use and meaning of **βαστάζειν** in the important doctrinal statement, Matth. viii. 17, as exemplified by this passage, see *Magee, Atonement*, No. XLII. Vol. I. p. 415 sq.

καὶ οὕτως **ἀναπληρώσετε**] ‘and thus

*shall ye fulfil,’—thus, in this way and no other, viz. by following the exhortation just given. Future after imperat., as in ch. v. 16. On the whole (see crit. note) the future seems the more probable, as well as perhaps the more strictly grammatical reading; for though no opposing argument can be founded on the use of the imper. aor. combined with the imper. present (the former often stating the *general* command, the latter some of the *details*; comp. *Schömann, Iesus*, p. 235), still in the case of this particular verb the use of the present (comp. *Barnab. Ep.* 21, **ἀναπληροῦτε πάσας ἐποληῆν**) is much more natural. The compound **ἀναπληροῦν** is not simply synonymous with **πληροῦν** (*Ridk.*, al.), but appears in all cases to denote a *complete* filling up, and to point to a *partial* rather than an entire vacuum; ‘haec demum erit perfecta legis impletio,’ *Winer, Verb. Comp. Fasc. III.* p. 11; comp. *Plut. Poplic.* § 11, **ἀνεπλήρωσε τὴν βουλὴν διτεγαθροῦσαν** (‘made up the full number of’), and see notes on *Phil. ii. 30*. The explanation of Chrys., **κανῆ πάντες πληρώσατε**, is not satisfactory.*

τὸν νόμον τοῦ Χρ.] ‘the law of Christ,’ not generally ‘le mobile des actes du Chrétien’ (*Reuss, Théol. Chr.* IV. 16, Vol. II. p. 168), but definitely

3 νόμον τοῦ Χριστοῦ. εἰ γὰρ δοκεῖ τις εἶναι τι μηδὲν ὡν,
4 φρεναπατᾶ ἔαυτόν. τὸ δὲ ἔργον ἔαυτοῦ δοκιμαζέτω

'the law of love' (*τὴν ἀγάπην φησίν*, Theod.-Mops.), which He gave (John xiii. 34, ἐτολήν κανὴν διδωμι ὑμῖν, *τινα ἀγαπάτε ἀλλήλους*: John iii. 23, ἀγαπῶμεν ἀλλήλους καθὼς ἔδωκεν ἐτολήν ἡμῖν), and which He so graciously exemplified, *αὐτὸς γὰρ τὰς ἀμαρτίας ἡμῶν ἀνέλαβε καὶ τὰς νόσους ἐβάστασεν* Schol. ap. Matth. The peculiar term *νόμος* is *perhaps* here chosen with some reference to the case of the Galatians: they affected an observance of the law of Moses, here was a law of Christ in which was included the fulfilment of the whole law; comp. ch. v. 14. This '*novum praeceptum Christi*' is illustrated and explained by Knapp, *Script. Var. Arg.* No. x. p. 369 sq.

3. εἰ γὰρ κ.τ.λ.] 'For if any one thinks &c.' confirmation of the foregoing exhortation to gentleness and humility, by showing the evils of the opposite course. The best motive to indulgence towards others is, as Olsh. remarks, the sense of our own weakness.

μηδὲν ὄν] 'when he is nothing,' 'being all the time nothing'; temporal, or in the more accurate language of Schmalfeld, 'temporal-concessive' participle, stating what the man after all is, in spite of his opinion of himself; see the exx. in Schmalfeld, *Synt.* § 207. 2, p. 415. Alford finds in this use of the subjective *μηδὲν* rather than *οὐδὲν* (absolute) a fine irony, —'being, if he would come to himself and look on the real fact.' This however is somewhat precarious, as the use of the subjective negation with participles is the prevailing usage in the N. T.; see Green, *Gr.* p. 122. While then we may press *οὐ* when so connected, we must be careful in overpressing *μή*, see notes on *1 Thess.* ii. 15, iii. 1.

For illustrative exx.

of the general form of expression, see Wetst. in loc., and Kypke, *Obs.* Vol. II. p. 291; one of the most apposite is Plato, *Apol.* p. 41 E, ἐὰν δοκῶσι τι εἶναι μηδὲν ὄντες.

φρεναπατᾶ] 'deceiveth his own mind,' 'inwardly deceiveth himself;' comp. Goth., 'frajja-marzeins ist' [intellectus deceptio est]. The verb is an *ἀπαξ λεγ.* in the N. T.; comp. however *φρεναπάτης*, Tit. i. 10, and *ἀπατῶν καρδίαν* ἔαυτοῦ James i. 26. This last passage may perhaps enable us to draw a distinction between *ἀπατᾶ* ἔαυτὸν and *φρεναπατᾶ* ἔαυτὸν. The former may imply a deception which had something objective to rest upon; the latter a more studied, inward-working, and purely subjective deception; comp. notes on *Tit.* i. 10. Hence the force of the command which follows, *τὸ ἔργον δοκιμαζέτω*, let him put to the proof his outward acts, and upon them form his judgment. The gloss of Hesych. (*χλευδζεῖ*), or even of Zonaras (*διαπαίζει*) does not, consequently, seem quite sufficient. The order *ἔαυτὸν φρεναπ.* [Rec. with DEFGKL; al.] is well supported, but inferior in point of critical authority to that of the text (*Lachm.*, *Tisch.*, with ABCN; 8o, al.), and not improbably a correction to give *ἔαυτὸν* studied prominence.

4. τὸ ἔργον ἔαυτοῦ δοκιμ.] 'prove his own work.' put to the test all that he is particularly engaged on; 'rem non opinionem de se,' Beng. The singular with the article is appy. here used collectively (De W., Mey.), scil. *τὰς ἔαυτοῦ πράξεις*, Theophyl., *τὰ βεβιωμένα αὐτῷ*, Ecum.; 'universam agendi rationem complectitur,' Schott: comp. Rom. ii. 15, 1 Pet. i. 17; and see Winer, *Gr.* § 27. 1, p. 157. On the meaning of *δοκιμάζειν* (*met'* *ἀκρι-*

ἔκαστος, καὶ τότε εἰς ἑαυτὸν μόνον τὸ καύχημα ἔξει, καὶ οὐκ εἰς τὸν ἔτερον ἔκαστος γὰρ τὸ ἴδιον φορτίον 5 βαστάσει.

βελας ἔξερδζεων, Theoph.), see notes on *Phil.* i. 10; *Suicer, Thesaur.* s. v. Vol. I. p. 936; and for a good practical sermon on this and the preceding verse, *Usher, Serm.* III. Vol. XIII. p. 31 sq. (ed. Elrington).

τὸ καύχημα κ.τ.λ.] ‘*his ground of boasting.*’ The true meaning of this passage has been somewhat obscured by a neglect of the exact meaning and force of the different words. (1) The concrete καύχημα, *gloriandi materies* (*Rom.* iv. 2, 1 *Cor.* ix. 15, 16, al.), must not be confounded with καύχησις, *gloratio* (*Rom.* iii. 27, al.), the distinction between these words being appy. always observed in the N. T., even in 2 *Cor.* v. 12, ix. 3, al.: (2) the article is not used καὶ’ ἔξοχήν, but pronominally (*Middleton, ch.* v. 3), ‘*his ground of boasting,*’ the καύχημα which properly belongs to him; comp. 1 *Cor.* iv. 5, τὸτε δὲ ταυτὸς γενήσεται ἔκαστῳ’ (3) the prep. εἰς must in each clause bear the same meaning (opp. to *De Wette*); the most simple and suitable appearing to be, ‘*with regard to,’* ‘*in relation to,’* not ‘*contra,’* Schott (which can be justified, e.g. *Luke* xii. 10, but connected with ἔαυτ. would involve an artificial explanation); comp. 2 *Cor.* xi. 10, ὡς καύχησις αὐτὴν εἰδ φραγῆσεται εἰς ἔμε· *Eph.* iii. 16, κραταιώθησαι...εἰς τὸν ἐπων ἀθρωτῶν’ comp. *Winer, Gr.* § 49. a, p. 354; *Bernh. Synt.* v. 11, p. 220: (4) the force of τὸν ἔτερον (not ἔτερον, as implied by *Auth.*) must not be overlooked, scil. ‘*the one with whom he is contrasting himself;*’ ‘*his neighbour,*’ *Copt., Arm.* The meaning of the whole clause then will be, ‘*If any one wishes to find matter for boasting, let it be truly searched for*

in his own actions, and not derived from a contrast of his own fancied virtues with the faults of others;

comp. *Hammond in loc. True Christian καύχημα*, like St Paul’s, must be found either in a deep and thankful acknowledgment of blessings and successes (ἐπι Κυρίῳ καύχεσθω, 2 *Cor.* x. 17), or in afflictions and weakness (2 *Cor.* xi. 30, xii. 5), which still more show forth both the mercy and the mighty power of the Lord; comp. 2 *Cor.* xii. 9.

5. ἔκαστος γαρ] ‘*For each man;*’ confirmatory clause standing in close connexion with the last words of ver. 4, and assigning the reason why a man would have little real or just ground for claiming spiritual superiority over his neighbour: he had only to look at himself to see that he had his own burden to bear; καὶ σὺ κακέως τὸ τοῦ φορτίου βαρύσσετε· *Eccum.* φορτίον] ‘*load;*’ not identical with the preceding βάρος, ver. 2 (*Vulg.*, *Clarom.*, *Arm.*, but not any of the other Vv.), which perhaps is used as a more general term in reference to the community at large, while φορτ. has a more individualizing reference to the particular load of sins and infirmities which each one, like a wayfarer (comp. *Ecclesiastes* xxi. 16, *Xenoph. Mem.* III. 13. 6), had to carry: ‘*alii sunt onera participandæ infirmitatis, alii reddendæ rationis Deo de actibus nostris: illa cum fratribus sustentanda communicauntur, hæc propria ab unoquoque portantur:*’ *August. de Consens. Evang.* II. 30. 72. The qualitative and humbling distinction of Chrys. (τοῦ δύδασι τοῦ φορτίου καὶ τῆς ἀχθοφορίας πιέζων τὸ συνειδός), and the quantita-

6 Κοινωνείτω δὲ ὁ κατηχούμενος τὸν Be liberal to your
now, whether it be to the flesh or to the Spirit, so shall ye reap.

tive of Beng. ('φορίον, par fermentis viribus: βάρη quae excedunt') do not appear so natural or probable. The allusion which Conyb. here finds to Aesop's well-known fable (the Πῆραι δύο, p. 165, ed. De Furia) is not very plausible, as the point of the fable and the tenor of this verse are far from being identical. **βαστάσαι** 'shall bear,' scil. 'has to bear,' 'must bear.' The future does not here refer to the day of judgment (Theod., al.; see ch. v. 10), nor even (like ξει) to the future period when the conviction is arrived at, 'will find he has to bear' (Windisch., al.); but is appy. used *ethically* in ref. to what according to the nature of things *must* be the case; comp. notes on *Eph.* v. 31; Thiersch, *de Pent.* III. 11, p. 158 sq.; and see exx. in Jelf, *Gr.* § 406. 3, and Bernhardy, *Synt.* X. 5, p. 377. It was not so much from a sense of future responsibility, as from a consciousness of present unavoidable *ἀχθοφορία*, that a man would be led to think humbly of himself and kindly of his neighbour. The observation of Fritzsche on the use of the future is worthy of citation; 'Futurum in sententiā generali recte ponitur, quandoquidem rei quae in nullum tempus non convenire videatur etiam futuro tempore locum futurum esse jure sumitum:' on *Rom.* vii. 3, Vol. II. p. 9.

6. κοινωνεῖτω δὲ κ.τ.λ.] 'But let him that is instructed...share with, &c.' exhortation to the duty of sharing temporal blessings with others, placed in contrast (δὲ) to the foregoing declaration of individual responsibility in spiritual matters. With regard to the construction there is some little doubt whether *κοινωνέω* is here transitive ('sit benignus in magistrum in

omni bonorum genere,' Fritz. *Rom.* l.c.; comp. Chrys. πᾶσαν ἐπιδεκυνόθω περὶ αὐτὸν δαψιλεῖαν), or intransitive. The verb has three constructions in the N. T.; (a) with gen. of the *thing*, only Heb. ii. 14; (b) with dat. of *thing*, the common construction, Rom. xii. 13, xv. 27, 1 Tim. v. 22, 1 Pet. iv. 13, 2 John 11; (c) dat. of *person*, the *thing* under the regimen of a prep., Phil. iv. 15. In all these instances (even in Rom. xii. 13) the meaning seems clearly *intransitive*. The same appears to be the meaning in the present case: for though the transitive constr. is lexically admissible (*κοινωνῶ σοι ὡν ἔχω, ἀντὶ τοῦ μεταδίδωμι*: Thom.-Mag.), and yields a perfectly good sense; still the prevailing use of *κοινωνέω* in the N. T., the analogy of construction between this passage and Phil. iv. 15, οὐδεμίᾳ μοι ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐκοινώησεν εἰς λόγον δόσεως καὶ λήμψεως, and the general context, supply arguments in favour of the *intransitive* meaning which seem distinctly to preponderate.

δ κατηχούμ. τὸν λόγον] 'he that is instructed in THE WORD,' scil. in the Gospel (see *Acts* xv. 7, τὸν λόγον τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, and comp. *Luke* i. 2), τὸν λόγον being the accus. of reference, or what is termed 'the qualitative object' (Hartung, *Casus*, p. 55, 61) after the pass. part. *κατηχούμενος* (*Acts* xviii. 25); see Winer, *Gr.* § 32. 5, p. 204, and esp. Schmalzfeld, *Synt.* § 25, compared with § 16, ad fin. With regard to the meaning of *κατηχέω*, which has here been somewhat unduly pressed, we may observe that the word appears to have four meanings; (α) *sōno*; ἀντὶ τοῦ ἡχοῦ, Suidas; (β) *sōno impleo*; comp. Lucian, *Jup. Trag.* 39. *κατέδουσι καὶ κατηχοῦσι* (γ) *vivid*

λόγον τῷ κατηχοῦντι ἐν πᾶσιν ἀγαθοῖς. μὴ πλανᾶσθε, γ
Θεὸς οὐ μυκτηρίζεται. ὁ γὰρ ἐὰν σπείρῃ ἄνθρωπος,

vocē erudio, προγρέπομαι καὶ παρασῶ,
Suic.; comp. Syr.

ϢԸԾՈ? [qui audit], *Aeth.*; and see Joseph. Vit. § 69, where this meaning seems confirmed by the context *Ճկիցաւ քարտուրէ* and lastly (δ), with a more general and unrestricted reference, *edoces* (Յօձուա, Hesych., Zonaras),—*appy.* the meaning in the present case ('*sa laisida*', Goth., **1232450?** [qui instituit] Syr.-Phil.), and in the majority of the passages in the N. T. (Luke i. 4, Acts xviii. 25, Rom. ii. 18; perhaps even 1. Cor. xiv. 19, Acts xxi. 21, 24) in which it occurs; the idea of *oral* teaching being merged in that of general instruction however communicated. On the use of the word, esp. in Eccl. writers, see Suicer, *Thesaur.* s. v. Vol. I. p. 69 sq., where this word is fully explained. *ἐν πᾶσιν ἀγαθοῖς*] 'in (sphere of the action of κουωμὲν) all good things,' i.e. 'all temporal blessings;' compare 1. Cor. ix. 11. There does not seem sufficient reason for leaving the ancient interpretation, *κελεύει τοῖς πνευματικῶν ἀπολάνοντι μεταβόνται τῶν σαρκικῶν*. (Ecum.: see Neand. *Planting.* Vol. I. p. 152 note (Bohn). The usual objections are based on the isolation of the verse from ver. 5 and ver. 7, which this interpretation is thought to cause. This however does not appear to be the case. The concluding words of ver. 5, if left without any further addition, might have been misconstrued into an implied declaration that it was not right to be chargeable on anybody. This the Apostle specially, but almost parenthetically, obviates, indicating with δὲ (see above) the contrast be-

tween the spiritual and the temporal application.

7. *μὴ πλανᾶσθε*] 'Be not deceived.' continuation of the subject in a more general and extended way, though still not without reference to the subject of the special command. This solemn and emphatic mode of admonition is used by St Paul in two other passages, 1. Cor. vi. 9, and xv. 33; in the former with reference to an evil act, in the later to an evil conclusion, just mentioned. In the present case the reference appears rather to what follows; though a reference to what precedes ('*præstringit tenaces*', Parseus) need not be excluded. Ignatius uses the same form, *Eph.* 5, 16, *Philad.* 3, *Smyrn.* 6.

οὐ μυκτηρίζεται] 'is not (actually, or with impunity) mocked;' 'non irridetur,' Vulg. This emphatic word is used several times in the LXX, and occasionally in later classical writers: *μυκτηρίζειν λέγομεν τοῦς ἐν τῷ διατάξει τιὰς τοῦτο πως τὸ μέρος (μυκτῆρα) ἐπιστῶντας.* *Etym.* M. s. v. *μυκτήρ*, p. 594 (ed. Gaisf.). Elsner (*Obs.* Vol. II. p. 199) has illustrated this meaning by a few examples, e.g. Quintil. *Inst.* VIII. 6. 59; Sueton. *August.* 4; Cicero, *Epiſt. Fam.* XV. 19. In Hippoc. p. 1240 D, it occurs in the sense of 'bleeding at the nose.'

8. *γὰρ ἂν κ.τ.λ.*] 'for whatsoever a man soweth;' confirmation of the truth of the preceding assertion by means of a significant image (comp. Matth. xiii. 39) derived from the natural world. **τοῦτο καὶ οὕτων**] 'this—and nothing else than this—shall he also reap;' the καὶ with its ascensive force pointing to the regularly developed issues. Wetst. (*in loc.*) aptly cites Cic. *de Orat.* II. 65, 'ut se-

8 τοῦτο καὶ θερίσει· ὅτι ὁ σπείρων εἰς τὴν σάρκα ἑαυτοῦ
ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς θερίσει φθοράν, ὁ δὲ σπείρων εἰς τὸ
9 Πνεύμα ἐκ τοῦ Πνεύματος θερίσει ζωὴν αἰώνιον. τὸ δὲ

mentem feceris, ita metes.' On this text see two sermons by Farindon, *Serm. LXX., LXII.* Vol. I. p. 52 sq. (Lond. 1849).

8. ὅτι δὲ σπείρουν] 'Because he that is sowing;' reason for the concluding *τοῦτο καὶ θερίσει*, and exemplification of it in spiritual things; he that is sowing one kind of seed (the Spirit) will reap the regular products and developments of that seed; he that is sowing another (the flesh) those of that other: *Ἄστερ γάρ ἐπὶ τῶν σπερμάτων οὐκ ἔτι σπειροντα δρόβιον* (vetches) *σῖτον δημιούρων*: δεῖ γάρ τοῦ αὐτοῦ γένους καὶ τὸν σπόρον εἶναι καὶ τὸν δημιούρον Chrys.

τὴν σάρκα ἑαυτοῦ] 'unto, or for, his own flesh,' not 'in carne sua,' Vulg., Clarom.; for though the flesh and the Spirit are represented under the image of two corn-fields, in which seed is sown, and from which the harvest is gathered, the meaning of *εἰς* is still not *local* ('in, tanquam in agrum,' Beng.), but, in accordance with its more usual meaning, *ethical* ('carni sue,' Beza, comp. Copt.); the prepp. used in the N. T. in a *strictly local* sense being appy. *ἐν* and *ἐπὶ*, the former in reference to the enclosure in which the seed is sown (Matth. xiii. 24, 27, ib. 19, and metaphorically, Mark iv. 15, *Rec.*, *Lachm.*), the latter to the spot on which it is cast (Matth. xiii. 20, 23, Mark iv. 16, 20, 31). In the expression *εἰς τὰς διδύνθες* (Matth. xiii. 22, Mark iv. 18) *εἰς* rather means 'among'; comp. Plato, *Leg. VIII.* p. 838. § 2. The force of the pronoun *ἑαυτοῦ* must not be overlooked, *selfishness* being implied as well as carnality; 'caro suilati de-

dita est,' Beng.: compare Aquinas (cited by Windisch.), 'sed nota quod cum agit de seminatione carnis dicit in carne sua, quis caro est nobis, de natura nostra; sed cum loquitur de semine Spiritus non dicit *suo*, quia Spiritus non est nobis a nobis, sed a Deo.' φθοράν] 'corruption,'—of the whole man, both body and soul; not merely in the narrower physical sense of 'decay' (*καὶ γάρ αὐτὰ φθειρας καὶ συμφθείρει τὸ σῶμα* Chrys.); but also in the fuller ethical sense of 'corruption of soul,' in which of course eternal death and 'destruction' (Hesych. φθορά· θλεθρος) are involved and implied; see 2 Pet. i. 4, ii. 12, 19, and comp. Rom. vi. 21, 22. The use however of φθορᾶ rather than ἀπώλεια (Phil. iii. 19)—though it possibly may be introduced as more applicable to σρῆξ (Schott)—seems to preclude our adopting 'destruction' as the primary meaning; see Stier, *Ἐργα*. Vol. II. p. 180.

[ζωὴν αἰώνιον] 'eternal life;' ζωή, in contrast to the preceding φθορᾶ (comp. Psalm ciii. 4, Jonah ii. 7), and that too,—as the nature of the principle to which the sowing is made distinctly suggests,—*αἰώνιον*. On the meaning of the term *αἰώνιον*, comp. notes on 2 Thess. i. 9.

9. τὸ δὲ καλὸν ποιοῦντες] 'But in well-doing let us, &c.' exhortation to perseverance in the form of sowing just mentioned, the δὲ idiomatically introducing an address after foregoing details (comp. Eurip. *Rheo.* 165, *ταλ*, καὶ δίκαια ταῦτα...τίξαι δὲ μαθὼν κ.τ.λ.), and, though practically approaching in meaning to οὐν ('so let us not'), still preserving its proper force in the contrast between the corrupted

καλὸν ποιοῦντες μὴ ἐνκακῶμεν· καιρῷ γὰρ ιδίῳ θερίστο-
μεν μὴ ἐκλυόμενοι. ἄρα οὖν, ὡς καιρὸν ἔχομεν, ἐργαζώ· 10

class just prominently mentioned and the better class which is now addressed: see exx. in Hartung, *Partik.* δέ, 2. 5, Vol. I. p. 166. On the general and inclusive meaning of τὸ καλόν, see notes on ver. 10. [μὴ ἐνκακέμεν] ‘let us not lose heart.’ Both here and in the other passages where the word occurs (Luke xviii. 1, 2 Cor. iv. 1, 16, Eph. iii. 13, 2 Thess. iii. 13) *Lachm.* and *Tisch.* read ἐνκακ. (ἔγκ.) instead of ἐκκακ. (*Rec.*, al.), and rightly; as it seems very doubtful whether ἐκκακ. is a genuine word at all, and whether its occurrence in lexicons and use in later writers (see exx. collected by L. Dind. in Steph. *Thes.* s. v. Vol. V. p. 430) is not, as Usteri thinks, entirely due to these doubtful readings. At any rate, if ἐκκακ. exist, the difference will be very slight: ἐκκακέω may perhaps mean, ‘to retire from fear *out of* any course of action’ (nearly δικακέω); ἐνκακέω, ‘to behave with cowardice,’ ‘to lose heart, when in it.’ In Rost u. Palm, *Lex.* (Vol. I. p. 833), Polyb. *Hist.* IV. 19. 10 is cited in favour of ἐκκακέω. This is an oversight; the reading is ἐνεκκάκησεν, and is actually so cited by Rost u. Palm under ἐκκα-
κέω, see p. 761. [καιρῷ γὰρ
ἰδίῳ] ‘in due, proper time;’ ‘tempore
præstituto’ (Beza), the time appointed
by God for the reward to be given:
comp. καιροῖς ἰδίοις, 1 Tim. ii. 6, vi.
15. On the present use of the dative
to denote the space of time *within*
which the action takes place,—more
correctly expressed with an inserted
ἐν (Rom. iii. 26, 2 Thess. ii. 6, al.),—
see notes on 1 Tim. ii. 6, and comp.
Eph. ii. 12. [μὴ ἐκλυόμενοι] ‘if
(now) we faint not (in our well-doing);’
‘provided that we do not;’ hypothetical
use of the temporal participle, the

present tense pointing to the state in
which they must now be if they would
reap hereafter: see Krüger, *Sprachl.*
§ 56. 11, and exx. in Schmalfeld,
Synt. § 207. 5, p. 415. The simple
predicative connexion with θερίσουμεν

→  οὐδὲ [et non erit
molestum nobis] Syr., or the more
practically adverbial, ‘without fainting’ (surely not ‘unweigerlich,’
Ewald), scil. πόνου δικαία θερίσουμεν
(Theod., Theoph., al., who thus draw
a contrast between the toilsome nature
of the earthly, and the unwearying
nature of the heavenly harvest), does
not seem satisfactory. For though this
interpretation cannot be pronounced
grammatically incorrect on account of
the use of μὴ rather than οὐ (Rück.,
Schott),—the connexion of μὴ with
participles being so distinctly the pre-
vailing usage in the N. T. and later
writers (see notes on ver. 3, and comp.
exx. in Winer, *Gr.* § 55. 5, p. 428 sq.,
and in Gayler, *Partic. Neg.* p. 36),—
it still must be rejected on *exegetical*
grounds, as adding no particular force
to the general exhortation; whereas
the conditional meaning serves fully
to bring out the mingled warning and
encouragement (προφέρει καὶ ἐφύλα-
ται Chrys.) which seems to pervade
the verse.

The distinction drawn by Beng. between
ἐκκακέω (*Rec.*) in *velle*, and ἐκλύεσθαι
in *posse*, the former referring to the
faintness of heart, the latter to the
unstrung state, and the ‘(interna) viri-
um remissio,’ seems fairly tenable:
see exx. in Steph. *Thesaur.* s. v., from
which we may select (though with a
more simply physical ref.), Plutarch,
Moral. VI. 613, ἐκλελυμένος καὶ κε-
κρυκώς. A sensible sermon on this

μεθα τὸ ἀγαθὸν πρὸς πάντας, μάλιστα δὲ πρὸς τοὺς οἰκείους τῆς πίστεως.

verse will be found in Sherlock, *Serm. xxxix.* Vol. II. p. 275 sq. (ed. Hughes).

10. *ἀπα σὺν*] ‘Accordingly then,’ ‘So then;’ collective and inferential exhortation arising immediately out of the preceding statements, and bringing to a natural close the group of verses beginning with ver. 6, and the more directlyhortatory portion of the epistle. The proper meaning of *ἀπα*, *rebus ita comparatis*, and its primary reference to simple ‘progression to another step in the argument’ (Donalds. *Orat.* § 192), are here distinctly apparent; its weaker ratiocinative force being supported by the collective power of *οὕτω* ‘as things are so, let us in consequence of their being so,’ &c. In Attic Greek this combination is only found in the case of the interrogative *ἀπα*: see Herm. *Viger.* No. 292; and on the general distinction between *ἀπα* and *οὕτω*, see Klotz, *Devar.* Vol. II. p. 717, but comp. Donalds. *Gr.* § 604, and notes on ch. iii. 5. *ὡς καιρὸν ἔχομεν*] ‘as we have opportunity,’ i.e. ‘an appointed season for so doing;’ not merely ‘prout, i.e. quondamque et quotiescumque occasio nascatur’ (Wolf), but, ‘as, in accordance with the circumstances;’ see Meyer *in loc.* The particle *ὡς* is thus neither *causal*, ‘quoniam’ (Ust., al.), nor *temporal*, ‘dum’ (Vulg., Clarom., Syr.-Phil.), as appy. Ign. *Smryna.* 9, *ὡς ἐτι καιρὸν ἔχομεν* (both, esp. the latter, very doubtful meanings in St Paul’s Epp., though not uncommon in classical writers; see Klotz, *Devar.* Vol. II. p. 759), but has only its simple relative force; the true link between this and the preceding verse being supplied by *καιρός* (Brown, p. 348); ‘as there

is a *καιρός* for *τὸ θερήσεων*, so is there one for *τὸ σπείρεων*. As we have it then, let us act accordingly and make the most of it;’ *κατενέγει καὶ συνεθεῖ* Chrys. Hammond (*on Phil.* iv. 10) translates *καιρόν* ‘ability,’ but the exx. cited by Wetst. *in loc.* will show this modification to be quite unnecessary.

τὸ ἀγαθόν] ‘that which is good;’ ‘the thing which in each case is good,’ whether considered in a spiritual or temporal sense. The distinction between *τὸ καλὸν* as implying *good* in its highest sense, and *τὸ ἀγαθόν* as referring more particularly to *kindness*, &c. (Baum-Crus.), does not seem tenable in the N. T. As *τὸ καλὸν* includes what is beneficent (Matth. xii. 12) as well as what is morally good (1 Thess. v. 21), so *τὸ ἀγαθόν* includes what is morally and essentially good (Rom. ii. 10) as well as what is merciful (Philem. 14, comp. Eph. iv. 28), i.e. *ἀγαθωσύνην* as well as *εὐποίησην*, Heb. xiii. 16; comp. notes on 1 Thess. v. 21. The reading *ἐργαζόμεθα* adopted by Lachm. ed. stereotyp. (but retracted in larger ed.) with AB³L and some mss. is rightly rejected by recent editors on decidedly preponderant external evidence [B³CDEFGN, K -σώμεθα, and great majority of mss. Vv. and Ff.] and not without some probability of the interchange of the *ο* and *ω* (though rare in such MSS. as B) being here accidental; comp. Scrivener, *Collat.* p. LXXX sq. *πρὸς τοὺς οἰκείους τῆς πίστεως*] ‘unto them who belong unto the faith.’ The meaning of *πρὸς* is here not merely the general ethical one, *with regard to*, but the particular one, *erga*; comp. Eph. vi. 9, 1 Thess. v. 14 (notes), and exx. in Winer, *Gr.* § 49. h, p. 361. The

Recapitulation.

Your false teachers seek
to have you circumcised, to avoid persecution, and to boast of your submission.
All true boasting however must be in Christ and His Cross.

"Ιδετε πηλίκοις ύμιν γράμμασιν ἔγρα- 11

meaning *erga*, or *contra* (this latter rare if a hostile notion is not implied in the verb, Joseph. *Apion.* I. 31), will result from the context. With regard to the peculiar phrase *οἰκέοις τὴς πόλεως*, it may be observed that it does not appear to involve any allusion to *οἶκος* in the peculiar sense of ‘the house of God’ (Schott), or to any especial idea of composing a single *family* (Reuss, *Theol. Chrét.* IV. 13, Vol. II. p. 124); as the numerous exx. from later writers of this use of *οἰκέοις* with an abstract substant. (e. g. *οἰκέοις φιλοσοφίας, δληγαρχίας, γεωγραφίας, τρυφῆς*) all seem to show that the adjective has lost its meaning of peculiar, and only retains that of *general* though *close* connexion; see Schweighæus. *Lex. Polyb.* s. v., and Wetst. *in loc.* A sermon on this and the preceding verse, but of no marked character, will be found in Tillotson, *Serm. LXXXIX.* Vol. II. p. 592 (Lond. 1752).

11. πηλίκους ύμιν γράμμασιν [γράψα] ‘in what large letters I have written to you.’ The only possible way of arriving even approximately at the meaning of this much-debated clause is to adhere closely to the simple lexical meanings of the words. These it will be best to notice separately. πηλίκος strictly denotes *geometrical magnitude*, ‘how large’ (comp. Plato, *Meno*, p. 82 D, πηλίκη τις έσται ἑκείνου ἡ γραμμή; so too Zachar. ii. 2. πηλίκον τὸ πλάτος;...πηλίκον τὸ μῆκος;) in contradistinction to *arithmetical magnitude*, expressed by πόσος, ‘how many.’ This meaning and distinction appear to have been observed in the N.T., as in the only other passage in which πηλίκος occurs, Heb. vii. 4, πηλίκος οὐρὸς, the same primary idea

of *magnitude* (though in an ethical sense) is distinctly recognisable. To assume then in the present case (a) any confusion of πηλίκος with πόσος (Schott; Neander, *Planting*, Vol. I. p. 221, Bohn), when there is no trace of such a usage either in the N.T. or LXX., seems distinctly *uncritical*; nor can (b) any assumed equivalence with πόσος (‘qualibus literis,’ Vulg., Clarom., Arm., ‘wileikaim,’ Goth.; comp. Hesych. Πηλίκον οἷον, δύος, and see Tholuck, *Anzeig.* 1834, No. 32), and any reference to the διαρροία of the letters (Chrys., Theoph., Οεούμ., Theod. 2; comp. Zonar. *Lex.* s. v. πηλίκον· τὸ δὲ διαρροία δύο, ὡς παρὰ τῷ Ἀποστόλῳ ιδεῖ κ.τ.λ., Vol. II. p. 1547), be pronounced otherwise than purely *arbitrary*; for magnitude does not imply shapelessness. We can have then no other correct translation than simply, ‘*how large!*’ δύοις μελίσσοις ἔχονται γράμμασιν’ Theod., who however appears to limit the autographic portion to what follows. γράμματα may be interpreted ‘an epistle;’ see Acts xxviii. 21, comp. i Macc. v. 10, Ignat. Rom. 8: but (a) St Paul in no other passage so uses it, though he has occasion to use a word denoting a letter (ἐπιστολὴ) seventeen times; and (b) this species of cognate dative, γράψαι γράμμασι (comp. εἰπὲ λέγε, Matth. viii. 8) is not found in St Paul’s Epp., nor has here any of the additional force which the usage implies (Bernh. *Synt.* III. 16, p. 107), and which alone could account for the introduction of a *third* dative (instead of the natural accus.) in a sentence of eight words. We seem therefore forced to adhere to the simple meaning, ‘*letters, characters,*’ as in Luke xxiii. 38 (*Rec.*), 2 Cor. iii.

12 ψα τῇ ἐμῇ χειρὶ. ὅσοι θέλουσιν εὐπροσωπῆσαι ἐν

7: so Copt. *han-akhai*, and appy. Arm.; the other Vv. are ambiguous.

γράψα] 'I wrote,' or in idiomatic English, 'I have written,' in ref. to the whole foregoing epistle, not 'I write' (Scholef. *Hints*, p. 97, Conyb., al.), epistolary aorist. The real difficulty lies in this word, owing to the different conclusions to which historical and grammatical considerations appear respectively to lead us. On the one hand it appears distinctly (Rom. xvi. 22, 1 Cor. xvi. 21, Col. iv. 18, 2 Thess. iii. 17) that St Paul was in the habit of using an amanuensis, and of adding only the concluding words. From ver. 11 to end would seem then very probably such an addition. But on the other hand, it is very doubtful whether St Paul or any of the writers of the N.T. ever use the epistolary aor. **γράψα** exclusively in reference to *what follows*. The aorist in all cases appears to have its proper force, either (a) in reference to a former letter (1 Cor. v. 9, 2 Cor. ii. 3, 4, 9, vii. 12, 3 John 9 [see Lücke in loc.]); or (b) in reference to an epistle now brought to its conclusion (Rom. xv. 15, 1 Pet. v. 12); or (c) to a foregoing portion of the epistle (1 Cor. ix. 15, 1 John ii. 21 [see Lücke and Huther in loc.], comp. Philem. 19), even standing in a species of antithesis to **γράψω** in reference to what has already been written (1 John ii. 13, 14, where see Huth.); see Winer, *Gr.* § 40. 5. 2, p. 249, and notes on *Philem.* 19. With this partially conflicting evidence it seems impossible to decide positively whether St Paul wrote the *whole* epistle or only the *concluding portion*. On the whole however, the use of **γράψα**, especially when contrasted with **γράψω** (2 Thess. iii. 17), inclines us to the former sup-

position; and we thus conclude, that to prevent any possible mistake as to the authorship of the epistle (Chrys.; comp. 2 Thess. ii. 2),—especially as this was an encyclical missive (ch. i. 2, where see Olsh.),—St Paul here deviated from his usual custom, and wrote the *whole* letter with his own hand (Chrys., Theod., Theoph., ΟΕCUM.), and in characters, whether from design or inexpertness, larger than those of the ordinary amanuensis.

12. **ὅσοι θέλουσιν**] 'As many as wish.' concluding warning against the false Teachers whose true motives are here exposed, and contrasted with those which influenced the Apostle (ver. 14). **εὐπροσωπῆσαι ἐν σαρκὶ** 'to make a fair show in the flesh,' not so little as 'placere,' Vulg.,

Clarom., or even **οἰστιδαῖ?** [ut glorientur] Syr., but rather 'pulchram faciem assumere' [*shi skenko*] Copt., scil. 'to wear a specious exterior' in the earthly unspiritual element in which they move. The verb **εὐπροσωπέω** is not used by any earlier writer: but from the use of the adj. **εὐπρόσωπος**, 'fair and specious' (Herod. VII. 168; Demosth. *Coron.* p. 277; see Elsner, *Obs.* Vol. II. p. 200), and the similar compounds **σεμιοπροσωπέω** (Aristoph. *Nub.* 363) and **φαυστροσωπέω** (Cic. *Att.* VII. 21) cited by the commentators on this verse, the meaning would appear correctly stated by Chrys. as **εὐδοκιμῶ**, though not necessarily **παρὰ ἀνθρώπους** see below. The appended words **ἐν σαρκὶ** are commonly explained, either (a) 'in observatione rerum carnalium,' with physical reference to circumcision; or (b) 'apud homines,' with reference to the judgment and opinions of others,—**ἴνα ἀνθρώπους ἀρέσωσι** Chrys., *τὴν*

σαρκί, οὗτοι ἀναγκάζουσιν ὑμᾶς περιτέμνεσθαι, μόνον
ἴνα τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ Χριστοῦ μὴ διώκωνται. οὐδὲ γὰρ 13
οἱ περιτεμνόμενοι αὐτοὶ νόμον φυλάσσουσιν, ἀλλὰ θέλου-

12. διώκωνται] *Tisch.* διώκονται, with ACFGKL; many mss.: few scholars however will hesitate to consider this an improbable solecism. The text is rightly adopted by *Grieb.*, *Scholz.*, *Lachm.*, *Alf.*, with BDEN, and appy. many mss. The transposition *τὸν μὴ* (*Rec.* with FGKL; mss.) is rightly rejected by nearly all recent editors.

παρὰ διθράπων θηράμενοι δόξαν· Theod. Both interpretations however seem distinctly insufficient, as they put out of sight that more profound and far-reaching meaning of σάρξ, 'the earthly existence and conditions of man,' 'notio universa rerum externarum' (Schott), which pervades this whole epistle: see notes on ch. v. 16, and Müller, *Doctr. of Sin*, ch. II. ad fin., Vol. I. p. 353 (Clark).

οὗτοι] 'these:' it is this class and this pre-eminently, that are engaged in constraining you, &c. see notes on ch. iii. 7.

τῷ σταυρῷ] 'on account of the cross,' not exactly 'in cruce' (Copt.), but 'ob crucem' (Beza), so ill. 'for preaching the doctrine of the cross of Christ.' The dative points out the ground or cause of the persecution; comp. Rom. xi. 20, τῷ διωτρίᾳ ἐξελάσθησαν and see Winer, *Gr.* § 31. 6, p. 193; Bernhardy, *Synt.* III. 14, p. 102. The ablative explanation, that they may be persecuted with the cross of Christ ('perpessiones Christi, 2 Cor. i. 5, 'Grot., comp. Vulg. 'crucis Christi persecutionem'), either, on the one hand, involves an unsatisfactory explanation of δ σταυρός,—which, as Brown (p. 359) rightly observes, in such expressions as the present always implies the fact of the atoning death of Christ,—or, on the other, causes a still more untenable meaning to be assigned to διώκωνται, viz. 'lest the doctrine of Christ wear a hostile aspect to them,' as Neand. *Planting.* Vol. I.

p. 226 (Bohn). The meaning, 'that they may not follow after,' Arm. (comp. *Æth.* 'ut non adhæreatis') is wholly untenable.

13. οὐδὲ γὰρ . . . αὐτοῖς] 'For not even...themselves,' 'nam ne ipsi quidem,' Beza,—they of whom it might reasonably have been expected; confirmation of what precedes by a statement of the openly lax conduct of the Judaizers, and of the true motives by which they were influenced; 'tantum abest ut illorum intersit a vobis legem observari.' Beng. On the force of οὐδὲ...δλλά, see on ch. i. 17.

οἱ περιτεμνόμενοι] 'those who are having themselves circumcised,' 'qui circumciduntur,' Vulg.; pres. part., with reference to the prevailing practice of the false teachers either in respect of themselves or others. The explanation of Peile, Hilgenf., al., according to which the pres. part. περιτεμν. loses its precise temporal reference (Winer, *Gr.* § 45. 7, p. 316) and combines with the article to form a kind of subst. 'the party or advocates of the circumcision' (comp. οὗτοι οἱ περιτεμνόμενοι, *Acta Pet. et Paul.* § 63, cited by Hilgenf.) is plausible, but perhaps not necessary; as the use of the pres. may be fairly explained on the ground that St Paul includes in the idea not merely their conformity to the rite (which strictly becomes a past act), but their endeavour thereby to draw others into the same state, which is a present and continuing act.

σιν ὑμᾶς περιτέμνεσθαι ἵνα ἐν τῇ ὑμετέρᾳ σαρκὶ καυχήσῃσθαι. ἐμοὶ δὲ μὴ γένοιτο καυχᾶσθαι εἰ μὴ ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, δι’ οὐ ἐμοὶ

15. *οὐτε γάρ]* So *Tisch.* with *B*; 17; *Syr.*, *Goth.*, *Sah.*, *Aeth.*, *Arm.*; *Chrys.*, *Syncell.*; *Hieron.*, *Aug.* (*De W.*, *Mey.*, *Bagge*, *Alf.*), much commended by *Griesb.*; approved by *Müll.*, *Prolegom.* p. 84. The longer reading, *ἐν γάρ Χριστῷ Ἰησοῷ* is found in *ACDEFGKLN*; *Vulg.*, *Clarom.*, *Copt.*, *Aeth.-Platt.*, *Syr.-Phil.* with asterisk; *Theod.*, *Dam.*; *Ambrst.*, al. (*Rec.*, *Scholz*, *Lachm.*).

It must be admitted that the reading, *περιτεμμένοι* [*Lachm.*, *Scholz*, *Rinck*, *Mey.*, with *BL*; 40 mss.; *Clarom.*, al.; *Lat. Ff.*] would give a more appropriate sense; the external authorities, however [*ACDEKN*; *Vulg.*, *Syr.* (both), al.; *Marcion* ap. *Epiph.*, *Chrys.*, *Theodore*, al.] are distinctly in favour of the more difficult reading, *περιτεμόνεοι*. *νόμον]* ‘the law.’ Middleton here explains the anarthrous *νόμος* as ‘moral obedience’ (‘the principle of Law,’ Peile), adducing the parallel passage, Rom. ii. 25; but there also, as here, *νόμος* is the Mosaic law: see Alford on *Rom. l.c.* The reason why these Judaizers did not keep the law is not to be referred to their distance from Jerusalem (Theod.), nor to any similarly extenuating circumstances, but, as the context seems to show, is to be attributed simply to their consummate hypocrisy; see Meyer *in loc.*

ἐν τῇ ὑμετέρᾳ σαρκὶ] ‘in your flesh,’—‘your bodily and ritualistic mutilation;’ i.e. *ἐν τῷ κατακόπτεω τῇ ὑμετέρᾳ σάρκᾳ* Theoph.,—not *their own* observances of that law for which they are affecting so zealously to contend. There is no contradiction between the two motives assigned for their enforcement of the circumcision. The second, as Usteri observes, states positively what the first stated negatively. They boasted that they had not only made Chris-

tian, but Jewish converts (‘quod vos Judaismo implicuerint,’ Beza), and thus sought to escape persecution at the hands of the more bigoted Jews.

14. *ἔποι οὐ μὴ γάρ καρκύ]* ‘But from me far be it to boast;’ contrasted treatment (*δὲ*) of the feelings of the Apostle and the substratum on which his *καίχησις* alone rested. For exx. of this use of *γένοιτο* with an inf., see Gen. xliv. 7, 17, Josh. xxii. 29, al., and Polyb. *Hist.* xv. 10. 4, *μηδενὶ γένοιτο πεῖραν ὑμῶν λαβεῖν*.

ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ] ‘in the cross:’ i.e. in that suffering, humiliation, and here more especially self-abnegation (Gal. ii. 20 sq.), which is essentially involved in the idea of the Redeemer’s cross: *καὶ τοὶ ἔστι τὸ καύχημα τοῦ σταυροῦ;* “*Οὐτὶ δὲ Χριστὸς δι’ ἐμὲ τὸν δοῦλον, τὸν ἔχθρόν, τὸν ἀγνώματα· διλλ’ οὐτω με ἔγκριψεν ὁς καὶ ἀντὸν ἐκδούσαν δρῆ.* Chrys. See a sound sermon on this text by Beveridge, *Serm. XXI. Vol. I.* p. 396 sq. (A.-C. Libr.).

δι’ οὐ] ‘by whom;’ scil. ‘by whose crucifixion.’ The relative may refer either to *σταυρός* (Theodore), or to ‘*Ἰησοῦ Χριστός*. It is curious that Baumg.-Crus. in adopting the latter reference, and Windischm. the former, should both urge that on the contrary supposition St Paul would have written *ἐν φ* instead of *δι’ οὐ*. As far as this argument goes, both are right (see Winer, *Gr.* § 48. a, p. 346, 347); though probably the frequent use of *ἐν* in the N.T.

κόσμος ἐσταύρωται καγὼ τῷ κόσμῳ οὐτε γὰρ περι- 15
τομή τι ἔστιν οὐτε ἀκροβυστία, ἀλλὰ καινὴ κτίσις. καὶ 16

The external evidence is thus *very strong*; still the probability that the longer reading is a gloss from ch. v. 6, seems so great, that, supported as we are by ancient Vv., we do not hesitate in adhering to the shorter reading. The reading *τοχέει* (*Rec.* with D³KL; mss., al.) has less claim on attention.

with reference to Christ is slightly in favour of Windischmann; comp. Eph. i. 7. The context however is a far surer guide, and here, as the important and indeed emphasized subject *τοῦ Κυρ. ἡμ. Ἰησ. Χρ.* immediately precedes, the relative will more naturally seem to refer to those words. [κόσμος] 'the world;' τὰ βιωτικὰ πρόγυματα Chrys.; not 'res et religio Judaica,' Schoettg. The full meaning has been well expressed by Calvin, 'mundus procul dubio opponitur novae creaturæ; quicquid ergo contrarium est spirituali Christi regno mundus est, quia ad veterem hominem pertinet. Mundus est quasi objectum et scopus veteris hominis' (cited by Peile). The present omission of the article with κόσμος is very unusual, and only to be accounted for by the supposition that κόσμος was sometimes practically regarded in the light of a proper name: in all other places in the N.T.,—except the present, 2 Cor. v. 19, and, somewhat differently, 2 Pet. ii. 5,—the omission is only found after a preposition (1 Cor. viii. 4, Phil. ii. 15, Col. ii. 20), or when the noun is under the regimen of a preceding substantive (John xvii. 24, Rom. i. 20, iv. 13, xi. 12, 15, Eph. i. 4, al.); see Middl., *Gr. Art.* p. 350 (ed. Rose); Winer, *Gr.* § 19, p. 112. Whether in the concluding member the article is to be retained or rejected (*Zachm.*) is very doubtful. The external authority [ABC¹D¹FGN; 17, Orig. (3), Ath., al.] for κόσμῳ is very strong;

still as an omission to conform with the preceding member seems highly probable, and the external authority [C³D³EKL; nearly all mss.; Clem., Orig.(7), and many Ff.] is of considerable weight, we retain with *Tisch.*, *Meyer*, al., the longer reading τῷ κόσμῳ.

[ἔμοι] 'to me,' dative of what is termed 'ethical relation,'—a usage of this case which is more fully developed in the dat. *commodi* or *incomm.*: see Winer, *Gr.* § 31. 4, p. 190; Bernhardy, *Synt.* III. 9, p. 85; Krüger, *Sprachl.* § 48. 5. This reciprocal crucifixion is a forcible mode of expressing the utter cessation of all communion between the Apostle and the world: as Schott well observes, 'alter pro mortuo habet alterum'; comp. John vi. 56, 2 Thess. i. 12, 1 Cor. vi. 13. On the profound significance of these expressions of union with Christ, comp. Reuss, *Theol. Chrét.* IV. 16, Vol. II. p. 164.

15. οὐτε γάρ] 'For neither;' explanatory confirmation of the preceding words & οὐ κ. τ. λ.: εἶδες σταυροῦ δύναμιν.....οὐ γὰρ δὴ μόνος τὰ τοῦ κόσμου πράγματα ἐνέκρωσεν αὐτῷ πάτερα, ἀλλὰ τὰ τῆς πολιτείας τῆς παλαιᾶς ἀνώτερος πολλῷ κατέστησεν Chrys. On the reading, see critical notes.

[καινὴ κτίσις] 'a new creature.' *Kriss.* has two meanings in the N.T.; *active* 'the act of creation' (Rom. i. 20), *passive* 'the thing created,'—whether personal and individual (2 Cor. v. 17), or impersonal and collective (Rom. viii. 19). Either meaning will suit the present passage; the latter per-

ὅσοι τῷ κανόνι τούτῳ στοιχοῦσιν, εἰρήνη ἐπ' αὐτοὺς καὶ
17 ἔλεος, καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰσραὴλ τοῦ Θεοῦ.

τοῦ

haps (comp. 2 Cor. v. 17, *εἴ τις ἐν Χριστῷ, κανὴ κτίσις*) is most probable. The form of expression may possibly have originated from the use of the similar term *הַשְׁלָמָה*, to denote proselytes (Schoettg. *Hor. Hebr.* Vol. I. p. 328); the meaning however and application is here of course purely Christian. On these words see an admirable sermon by Hammond, *Serm. XXVII. Part II.* p. 380 sq. (A.-C. Libr.); comp. also Beveridge, *Serm. XIX.* Vol. I. p. 342 sq. (A.-C. Libr.); and five sermons by Tillotson, *Serm. Vol. III.* p. 324 sq. (Lond. 1752).

16. *καὶ δέσμοι*] ‘And as many as walk,’ prominent specification of the personal subjects in regard of whom the prayer is offered, the nominative clause standing isolated, and passing *καὶ* *διακολονθίας* into another structure; see Jelf, *Gr.* § 477. I. The reading is doubtful. On the one hand, the fut. *στοιχήσουσιν* is well supported [BC¹KL^N; mss.; Vulg.; Chrys., Theod.], and perhaps not quite so likely to have been changed from the pres. as *vice versa*. Still, on the other, as the external evidence [AC¹DEFG; mss.; Clarom.; Syr. (both), Goth., Copt. (appy.), Arm.; Cyr., Jerome, Aug., al.] is very strong, and the change to a future, as pointing out the course the Galatians were to follow, not wholly improbable, we adopt with Tisch., *De W.*, al., the present *στοιχοῦσιν*.

τῷ κανόνι τούτῳ] ‘according to this rule,’ scil. of faith; *κανόνα ἑκάκεσε τὴν προκειμένην διδασκαλίαν*. Theod. It is perhaps slightly doubtful whether we are here to adopt the more literal meaning of *κανών*, ‘directing line’ (Mey.),  [semitam] Syr.; or

the more derivative meaning ‘maxim,’ ‘norma vivendi’ (*garaideinai*, Goth., *heg* [lex] *Aeth.*); the former seems at first sight in better accordance with *στοιχοῦσιν*, but as this verb is used above (ch. v. 25) with but little tinge of its physical meaning (contrast Rom. iv. 12), and as *κανών* may very naturally be referred to the principle stated in ver. 15, the latter and metaphorical meaning (*τῷ κανόνι καὶ τῇ διδαχῇ ταῦτη* Εcum.) is here to be preferred. On the derivative meaning of *κανών*, see an article by Planck, in *Comment. Theol.* Vol. I. I. p. 209 sq., and for exx. Elsner, *Ob.* Vol. II. p. 201. The dat. is obviously the *dativus normæ*; see notes on ch. v. 16; Winer, *Gr.* § 31. 6, p. 193; Fritz. *Rom.* xiii. 13, Vol. III. p. 142. *εἰρήνη ἐπ' αὐτοῖς*] ‘peace be upon them,’ ‘super illos,’ Vulg., Clarom., not perhaps without some idea of peace and mercy coming down *upon them* from heaven (Mey.); comp. Acts xix. 6, 2 Cor. xii. 9. It has been urged (De W.) that *ἐστιν* or *ἔσται* (Syr. , comp. Chrys.) is here to be supplied rather than *ἐπι*, and that the verse is to be regarded as declaratory, and not benedictory. Both the position of the verse however, and the significant union of *εἰρήνη* and *θλεος* (1 Tim. i. 2, 2 Tim. i. 2, 2 John 3, Jude 2) seem in favour of the ordinary construction; *ἐνηγόρησα τὸν θλεον καὶ τὴν εἰρήνην* Theod. The order (contrast 1 Tim. i. 2, 2 Tim. i. 2, Jude 2) may be due to the fact that the Apostle desires to put the effect before the ‘cause efficiens’ (Mey.), in order to sustain the re-assuring character of the benediction; or may arise merely from the feeling that in the

Trouble me not; I λοιποῦ κύπους μοι μηδεὶς παρεχέτω ἐγὼ
am Christ's accredited servant γὰρ τὰ στίγματα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐν τῷ
σώματί μου βαστάζω.

absence of *χρήσις*, *εἰρήνη* formed the more natural commencement. Jude 2 is rather different owing to the addition of *δύνατη*. On the meaning of *θλεός*, as involving not only 'misericordia' (*οἰκτηρία*) but 'ipsum misericordia succurrendi studium,' see Tittmann, *Synon.* p. 69 sq. καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰσραὴλ τοῦ Θεοῦ] 'and upon the Israel of God.' It is doubtful whether *καὶ* is explicative, 'namely upon the Israel of God,' or simply copulative. The explanatory *καὶ*, though needlessly obtruded on several passages of the N.T., is still distinctly found in St Paul's Epp. (contr. De Wette), see Fritz, *Rom.* ix. 23, Vol. II. p. 339; Winer, *Gr.* § 53. 3, p. 388. Still, as it is doubtful whether *καὶ* is ever used by St Paul in so marked an explicative force as must here be assigned (the exx. cited by Meyer, 1 Cor. iii. 5, viii. 12, xv. 38, do not seem conclusive), and as it seems still more doubtful whether Christians generally could be called 'the Israel of God' (contrast Brown, p. 382), the simple copulative meaning seems most probable (Ps.-Ambr., Grot., Est.). St Paul includes all in his blessing, of whatever stock and kindred; and then, with his thoughts turning (as they ever did) to his own brethren after the flesh (Róm. ix. 3), he pauses to specify those who were once Israelites according to the flesh (1 Cor. x. 18), but now are the Israel of God ('τοῦ Θεοῦ auctorem innuit; quem Deus veluti peculium suum reddidit'; Schott), true spiritual children of Abraham.

17. τοῦ λοιποῦ] 'Henceforth;' not for ἀπὸ τοῦ λοιποῦ (Bos, *Ellipses.* p.

461, Brown), or for λοιπόν (Bloomf.), though commonly used both for it and τὸ λοιπόν in later writers (Bernh. *Synt.* III. 36, p. 145), but the correct temporal genitive, denoting 'the time within which,' or at some epoch of which, the action is represented as taking place; comp. Madvig, *Synt.* § 66. a. Thus, taken strictly, τοῦ λοιποῦ κ. τ. λ. is 'let no one at any time in the future,' &c. τὸ λοιπόν κ. τ. λ. 'let no one during the future,' &c. comp. Viger, No. 26, 'τὸ λοιπὸν dicitur et τοῦ λοιποῦ hoc discrimine, quod τὸ λοιπὸν continuum et perpetuum tempus significat, τοῦ λοιποῦ autem repetitionem ejusdem facti reliquo tempore indicat.' The general temporal genitive, it may be remarked, appears to be more correctly referred to the *partitive* force of that case, than to ideas either of origination or antecedence (Hartung, *Casus*, p. 34; Jelf, *Gr.* § 523), or of possession (Alf.); see Scheuerl, *Synt.* § 15, p. 100; Donalds, *Gr.* § 451.

κῶνος...παρεχέτε] 'cause trouble;' surely not by obliging the Apostle to send further letters, but by troubling his spirit by their instability (*σαλευόμενος*, (Ecum.)), and still more, as the next clause shows, by thwarting his apostolic authority. ἐγὼ γάρ] 'for I,' reason for the command; the ἐγὼ being emphatic and in opposition to the false teachers,—not to *μηδεῖς* (De W.), unless treated as referring to one of them,—and the γάρ introducing the fact that he was a fully accredited servant of Christ: εἰς φίβων πλεῖστα ἐμβαλλων καὶ πηγῆς τοὺς παρ' αὐτοῦ τεθέντας νόμους' Chrys.

τὰ στίγματα] 'the marks;' the local

18 Ἡ χάρις τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χρι- Benediction.
στοῦ μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ὑμῶν, ἀδελφοί· ἀμήν.

addition ἐν τῷ σώματι μου necessarily referring the term to the wounds and scars and outward tokens of the persecutions and sufferings which the Apostle had undergone in the service of Christ; comp. 2 Cor. xi. 23 sq. There is appy. further a distinct allusion to the marks burnt on slaves to denote to whom they belonged; comp. Herod. VII. 233, ἔστι δέ στιγματα βασιλίκα· Martial, *Epigr.* XII. 61, ‘stigmate non meo;’ and especially Deyling, *Observ. Sacr.* Vol. III. No. 43, p. 423 sq., where the various classes of στιγματόφοροι are enumerated, and the whole subject copiously illustrated. The gen. ‘Ιησοῦ thus indicates neither origin (‘auctore Christo,’ Gom.), nor remote reference to (‘propter Christum,’ Pisc.; comp. Olah,—a most doubtful translation both here and 2 Cor. i. 5), but simply the owner: the marks attested who was the Apostle’s Master, and were the ‘signa militiae Christi quae me comprobant ejus esse;’ *Gloss. Interl.* (cited by Bagge). The insertion of Κυρίου before Ἰησοῦ (*Rec.*) is well supported [C⁸D³EKL^N(adding Xρ.); mss.; Vulg., Clarom., Syr. (both), Goth., *Aeth.-Platt*], but owing to the variations (D¹FG, ἡμῶν I. X.; Copt., *Aeth.-Pol.*, al., τοῦ Xρ.; al. aliter) rightly rejected by Lachm., Tisch. [with ABC¹; mss.; Amit.—but not Arm., as Tisch., *Alyf.*] in favour of the text.

βαστάζω] ‘I bear;’ either in the ‘sensus molestus’ of ch. v. 10, vi. 5, or perhaps, with some solemnity, in ref. to the dignifying nature of his Master’s marks: οὐν εἰπεν, ἔχω, ἀλλά, βαστάζω, ὥσπερ τις ἐπὶ τρωπαῖς μέγα φρονῶν ἢ σημεῖοις βασιλικοῖς’ Chrys.; comp. Acts ix. 15, βαστάσαι τὸ δρυόδι μου’ and Clem. *Hom. ap. Cotelar.* Vol. I. p. 692, εἰκὼν Θεοῦ βαστάζειν.

18. ἣ χάρις κ. τ. λ.] On the varied nature of the Apostle’s concluding benedictions, see the exx. and illustrations in notes on 1 *Thess.* v. 28.

μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ὑμῶν] ‘be with your spirit;’ not appy. with any allusion to the σάρξ (διδύων αὐτοὺς τὸν σαρκικῶν Chrys.), but simply with reference to the πνεῦμα as the ‘potior pars’ of man (“hominem a potiori parte sic antiquis dici Theologis, nec novum nec inusitatum est;” Heinsius, *Exerc.* p. 429), and not improbably to the fact that it is in the “spirit of man that the operations of grace make themselves felt; τῇ ψυχῇ τὴν χάριν ἔτείχεται γενέσθαι.” (Ecum.; comp. Philem. 25, 2 Tim. iv. 22, and notes in loc.

ἀδελφοῖς] Here the unusual position of the word seems to be intentional: they were indeed brethren; and though for a while severed from the Apostle, and the subjects of his censure, still brethren in their common Lord.

TRANSLATION.

THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARIES
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY

NOTICE.

THE general principles on which this translation has been drawn up are explained in the Preface. I will here only again remind the reader that as a general rule I have not departed from the Authorized Version, unless it appears to be either *incorrect, inexact, insufficient, obscure*, or (see Notice to the Translation of the *Pastoral Epistles*) noticeably *inconsistent* in its translations of more important expressions. These deviations are all stated in the notes: when no reason is there assigned for the change, it is because it is either self-evident, or given in the Commentary. I have also subjoined, in all the more important cases, citations from eight of the older versions, viz. those of Wiclid, Tyndale, Coverdale's Bible, Coverdale's Testament, Cranmer, Geneva, Bishops', and Rheims. For the citations from five of these (Wiclid's, Tyndale's, Cranmer's, the Genevan and Rhemish Versions) I am indebted to THE ENGLISH HEXAPLA of Messrs Bagster. Those from Coverdale have been taken respectively from the first edition of his Bible in 1535 (now made accessible to the general reader by the re-print of the same publishers), and from the venerable translator's Duglott Testament of 1538, which though expressly taken from the Latin, still contains some interesting and suggestive translations. The citations from the Bishops' Bible are derived from the second and slightly amended edition of 1572, a copy of the N. T. portion of which, in small portable quarto, apparently differing only from the folio edition in the modes of spelling, has been sometimes used for the sake of convenience. All these extracts, though but of doubtful authority in disputed texts, will still frequently be found to suggest useful alternative renderings, and will also give the reader such a practical acquaintance with the principles on which the Authorized Version was drawn up, as will tend to make him thankfully acknowledge, that it is truly, what Selden termed it, *the best translation in the world*.

The abbreviations in the notes will, I think, easily explain themselves. It may be only necessary to remark, that where an asterisk is affixed to a citation from the Auth. Version, the deviation in the text has arisen from a different reading. In the

text, the *italics* (which slightly differ from those in the first edition of the Auth. Vers.) denote as usual words *not in the original*; the small capitals mark words which are *emphatic* in the original, but which could not occupy an emphatic position in the translation without harsh inversions.

Since the first edition a few emendations (especially in reference to the aorist) have been introduced into the translation, and a few additional comments, either on the reasons for the changes, or on general principles of translation, inserted in the notes: see Notice to Translation of the *Epp. to the Thessalonians*.

As the subject of a revision of the Authorized Version is now becoming more and more one of the questions of the day, I again desire to remind the reader that the Revised Version which follows is only one designed for the *closet* (see Preface to *Pastoral Epistles*), and that it is in no way to be considered as a specimen of what might be thought a desirable form of an authoritative Revision. The more experience I gain in the difficult task of revising, the more convinced am I of the utter insufficiency and hopelessness of any single translator's efforts to produce a Version for general purposes. The individual may sometimes suggest something more or less worthy of passing consideration, but it is to the collective wisdom of the many that we can alone look for any hopeful specimen of a revision of the noble Version at present in use.

THE EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS.

PAUL an apostle, not from men neither by man, but I.
by Jesus Christ and God the Father who raised Him
from the dead,—and ALL the brethren which are with me, 2
unto the churches of Galatia. Grace be to you and peace 3
from God the Father and our Lord Jesus Christ who 4
gave Himself for our sins, that He might deliver us out
of the present evil world, according to the will of God

CHAPTER I. 1. *From]* Of, AUTH. and the other Vv. Though it does not seem desirable in every case to change the familiar *of* of AUTH. into the now more usual *from*, it is perhaps better to do so in most of the cases where it is used as a translation of *διπό*: where on the other hand *ἐκ* is used, *of (out of)* will often be found a very convenient translation; see notes on ch. iii. 16. With regard to *δια* it is nearly impossible to lay down any fixed principles of translation: where the idea of *medium* is designed to be expressed with especial distinctness, we may adopt *through*, but where this is not the case, the inclusive *by (agent, instrument, cause, means, Johnson)* will be found sufficiently exact, and commonly much more idiomatic.

2. *Which]* It may be here observed that archaisms as such are not removed from the Authorized Version except where a positive error is involved. Here there is none; *which* is not merely the neuter of *who*, but is a

compound word; Latham, *Engl. Lang.* § 305. 4 (ed. 3).

3. *And our]* So RHEM.: *and of, WiCL.; and from, AUTH.* and the other Vv. It seems desirable to leave out the preposition in the second member, as more true to the original; see notes on *Phil. i. 2 (Transl.)*.

4. *Out of]* So Cov. Test.: *from, AUTH.* and the remaining Vv. In the next words it seems better to retain AUTH. (changing *this* into *the*), as the transl. *world of evil* (ed. 1), though better preserving the unusual order of the Greek, might be thought to imply in the original the existence of a gen. of quality. Neither of the usual translations, *world*, or *age*, (though the former perhaps more nearly) gives the exact meaning of *ἀλώπ*: the best paraphrase seems, *spirit of the age*; see notes on *Eph. ii. 2. God and our Father]* Scholefield (*Hints on 1 Cor. xv. 24*), while fully admitting that the gen. refers only to the latter noun, suggests the omission

5 and our Father: to whom *be* the glory for ever and ever.
Amen.

6 I marvel that ye are so soon changing over from Him
that called you by the grace of Christ, unto a different
7 gospel: which is NOT another; save that there are some
who trouble you, and desire to pervert the Gospel of
8 Christ. Howbeit even if we, or an angel from heaven,
should preach any gospel unto you contrary to that
9 which we preached unto you, let him be accursed. As
we have said before, so say I now again, If any *man*
preacheth any gospel unto you contrary to that which ye

of the copula in translation (so Syr.,
Æth.) as more conformable to the
idiom of our language. As however
there are several cases where the
copula is omitted in the Greek, and
others, as here, where it is inserted, it
seems best, in so solemn a designation,
to preserve the distinction by
a special and even peculiar transla-
tion: so Vulg., Clarom., Copt., Arm.,
and Syr.-Philoc.

5. *The glory]* *Glory*, AUTH. As
the article is appy. here used *καὶ*
ἡγεμονίη (see notes), and may be inserted
in this passage without seriously violat-
ing English idiom, it seems best to
follow here the usage of AUTH. in
Matth. vi. 13 (*Rec.*).

6. *Changing over]* *Removed*, AUTH.;
moved, WICL.; *turned*, TYND., COV.
(both), CRAN., GEN., BISH.; *trans-
ferred*, RHEM. *By]* So CRAN.:
into, AUTH., WICL., RHEM.; *in*,
TYND., COV., BISH.; *unto*, COV. TEST.,
GEN.: see notes. *A different]*
Another, AUTH. and all the other Vv.

7. *Save that]* So COV. TEST.: *but
there be some that*, AUTH.; *but that
there be some*, WICL., TYND., COV.,
CRAN., GEN., BISH.; *unless*, RHEM.
The present participle might at first
sight seem to suggest the use of the
auxiliary *are troubling*; as however

οἱ ῥαπτοὶ ωρὲς is equivalent to a kind
of substantive, and serves to mark the
characteristic of the false teachers,
the (iterative) present is more appro-
priate; comp. Latham, *Engl. Lang.*
§ 573 (ed. 3).

8. *Howbeit]* Similarly, *neuerthe-
lesse*, TYND., CRAN., BISH.; *but*, AUTH.
and the remaining Vv. *Even if]*
Although, RHEM.; *though*, AUTH. and
remaining Vv. *Should preach]*

Preach, AUTH. and all the other Vv.
The idea of future contingency in-
volved in the use of *ἔστιν* with subj.
(Herm. Viger, No. 312) may here be
suitably expressed by inserting *should*.
*Any gospel, &c.] Any other gospel unto
you than*, AUTH., TYND., COV., CRAN.,
BISH.; *otherwaies than*, GEN.; *beside
that*, WICL., RHEM. *Preached]*
Have preached, AUTH. and the other
Vv.

9. *Have said]* So WICL., COV.
(both), RHEM.: *said*, AUTH. and the
remaining Vv. *Preacheth]*
Preach, AUTH.; change to the indica-
tive to preserve the opposition of
moods in original: see notes on 2
Thess. iii. 14 (*Transl.*). *Any
gospel, &c.] Any other gospel unto you
than that*, AUTH. *Received]*
Han undirfongen, WICL.; *Have re-
ceived*, AUTH. and the remaining Vv.

received, let him be accursed. For now am I making 10 men my friends, or God? or am I seeking to please men? if I were STILL pleasing men, I should not be a servant of Christ.

Now I certify you, brethren, touching the Gospel which 11 was preached by me that it is not after man. For 12 neither did I receive it from man, neither was I taught it, but through revelation from Jesus Christ. For ye heard 13 of my conversation in time past in Judaism, how that beyond measure I persecuted the Church of God, and was destroying it; and made advance in Judaism beyond many 14

10. Now am I making, &c.] Do I now persuade men? AUTH., BISH.; use persuasion to, RHEM.; councel I men? WICL.; preach I man's doctrine? TYND., GEN.; preach I men? Cov.; speak fayre, Cov. Test.; speak unto, CRAN. The change to the more definitely present, am I making, seems required by the emphasis which evidently rests on *apta*. On the nature of the English present, comp. Latham, *Engl. Lang.* § 573, 579 (ed. 3). If] So WICL., TYND., RHEM.: *for if, AUTH., CRAN., GEN. Am I seeking] Do I seek, AUTH., Cov. Test., RHEM.; whether I seek, WICL.; go I about, TYND. and the remaining Vv. Were still pleasing] Yet pleased, AUTH. A servant] Christis servant, WICL.; the ser., AUTH. and the other Vv.

11. Now] But, AUTH., Cov.; omitted in TYND., CRAN., GEN., BISH. Touching the Gospel, &c.] That the Gospel which was, &c. . . . is not, AUTH. Perhaps the text, which is more exactly in accordance with the order of the Greek, makes the denial a little more emphatic. By me] Of, AUTH. and all the other Vv.

12. Did I receive] So RHEM.: I neither received it, AUTH., Cov., CRAN.; ne I took it of man, ne learned,

WICL.; neither received I it, TYND., GEN.; I did not receive it nor learned it, Cov. Test. There is here some little difficulty in both preserving the emphasis on I, and also indicating that the first negative is not strictly correlative to the second. Perhaps the insertion of the auxiliary partially effects this, as it places the *neither* a little further from the verb, and still leaves it in that prominence which it seems most naturally to occupy. In ed. 1 (for I indeed received it not) this latter point was perhaps too much sacrificed. From man] Of man, AUTH. and all the other Vv. Through revelation from] Bi reuelacione of, WICL.; by the rev. of, AUTH. and the other Vv.

13. Ye heard] Ye have heard, AUTH. and the other Vv. Judaism] So RHEM.: the Jews' religion, AUTH.; the Jewishe rel., GEN., BISH.; the Jurie, WICL.; the Jews' wayes, TYND.; the Jewshippe, Cov. Was destroying it] Wasted it, AUTH.; faughte agen it, WICL.; spoyled it, TYND., Cov., CRAN., GEN., BISH.; drove them out, Cov. Test.; expugned it, RHEM. This change is made in consequence of the strong meaning of *πορθέω*, which it seems desirable to maintain. To resolve the other imperfects

my equals in standing in mine own nation, being more exceedingly zealous for the traditions of my fathers.
 15 But when it pleased God, who set me apart from my
 16 mother's womb, and called *me* through His grace, to re-
 veal His Son within me, that I might preach Him among
 the Gentiles; immediately I conferred not with flesh and
 17 blood: neither went I away to Jerusalem to them which
 were apostles before me; but I went away into Arabia,
 18 and returned again unto Damascus. Then after three
 years I went up to Jerusalem to visit Cephas, and I tarried
 19 with him fifteen days. But other of the apostles saw
 20 I none, save James the brother of the Lord. Now the

would make the sentence heavy and cumbrous, and add but little to the sense.

14. *Made advance, &c.] Profited in* (WICL., GEN., BISH., RHEM.) *The Jews' religion above, &c.* AUTH.; *prevayled in*, TYND., COV., CRAN.
Equals in standing] Equals, AUTH., RHEM.; *companions*, TYND., CRAN., GEN.
For] Of, AUTH.

15. *Set me apart] Departid me*, WICL.; *sundered me*, COV. TEST.; *separated me*, AUTH. and the other Vv. The change is made to prevent from being understood as local: see notes. *Through] By*, AUTH. and the other Vv. In this passage it seems desirable to adopt the more rigorous translation of *δια*, as suggesting more distinctly the fact that *χρησις* was not the *instrument*, but the *causa medians*; see notes.

16. *Within] In*, AUTH., WICL., COV., BISH., RHEM.; *by*, TYND., COV. TEST., CRAN.; *to*, GEN. *Gentiles]* So COV. TEST., GEN., RHEM.: *heathen*, AUTH. and the remaining Vv. *Conferred] So* AUTH. This transl. is not wholly adequate, but it is not easy to fix upon a more exact one. The original word seems to involve two ideas, *addressing oneself to* (*προσ*, di-

rection), and *taking counsel with*. Most of the older translations give prominence to the latter and more important idea, e.g. *I commened not of the matter*, TYND., COV., CRAN., GEN.; some of the moderns, e.g. Meyer, Lewin, express more distinctly the former. It seems difficult to combine both without paraphrasing. The singular translation in COV. TEST., *I did not graunt* (comp. *I condescended not*, RHEM.) results from the Vulg. *acquieci*.

17. *Away (bis)] *Up*, AUTH. In the concluding clause it seems better to maintain the order of AUTH. *returned again*, not as the Greek order might seem to suggest, *again returned*; for the *τὰλα* is only idiomatically added to the verb, and is appy. without any special emphasis; comp. ACTA XVIII. 21, and see exx. in Kühner on Xenoph. *Mem.* II. 4. 4

18. *Visit Cephas] See *Peter*, AUTH. and all the other Vv. *I tarried]* SIM. RHEM.: *abode*, AUTH., TYND., COV. (both), CRAN., GEN., BISH.; *dwellid*, WICL.

19. *The brother of the Lord]* SIM., *the brother of our Lord*, RHEM.; *the Lord's brother*, AUTH. and other Vv. This latter mode of translation is per-

things which I write unto you, behold, before God, I lie not. Afterwards I came into the regions of Syria and 21 Cilicia; and remained unknown by face unto the churches 22 of Judæa which were in Christ: but they were hearing 23 only that He who was our persecutor in times past is now preaching the faith which once he destroyed. And they 24 glorified God in me.

Then after fourteen years I went up again to Jeru- II. salem with Barnabas, and took Titus also with *me*. And I went up by revelation, and communicated unto 2 them the Gospel which I preach among the Gentiles, but privately to them which were of reputation, lest by any means I might be running, or have run, in vain. How- 3 beit not even TITUS, who was with me, though he was a Greek, was compelled to be circumcised: and that, be- 4

haps more appropriate when neither substantive has the article.

22. *Remained unknown]* *Was un-*
known, AUTH. and all the other Vv.

23. *Were hearing]* *Had heard*,
AUTH., COV., RHEM., BISH.; *hadden oonli an hearynge*, WIOL.; *heard*,
TYND., CRAN., GEN. Conybeare and Howson have given a good para-
phrase, *tidings only were brought them from time to time*; comp. Erasm.,
rumor apud illos erat. Who
was our persecutor] *Which persecuted us*, AUTH., TYND., CRAN., GEN., BISH.,
RHEM.; *that pursued us*, WIOL.; *that persecuted us*, COV.; *that did persecute us*, COV. TEST. Is now preaching]
Now *preacheth*, AUTH., TYND., (pr.
now) COV., CRAN., GEN., BISH.; doth now preach, COV. TEST.; doth now evangelize, RHEM. The change is made to mark more definitely the present act; comp. notes and ref. on transl. of ch. i. 10.

CHAPTER II. 1. After fourteen years] So RHEM.: *fourteen years after*, AUTH. and the other Vv. (after that,

TYND., COV.; thereafter, CRAN.). The change is perhaps desirable as it slightly tends to prevent the last-mentioned events being considered as the terminus a quo of the fourteen years. Titus also] So RHEM.: *Titus with me also*, AUTH., TYND., COV., GEN.; *Titus also beyng taken with me*, COV. TEST.; the rest omit *kal* in translation.

2. *The Gospel]* So all Vv. except AUTH., *that Gospel*. Might be running, &c.] Should (om. WIOL.) run or had run, AUTH. and all Vv. The text seems to preserve more exactly, and perhaps also more grammatically, the contrast between the pres. (subj.) and past tense. It may be observed that *should*, *simpliciter futuritionem indicat*: might, *de rei possibiliitate dicitur*. Wallis, Gram. Angl. p. 107.

3. *Howbeit not even]* Sim. *neuerthelesse nother*, COV. TEST.: *but neither*, AUTH., RHEM.; *and neither*, WIOL.; also *Titus...yet*, &c. TYND., CRAN., GEN. Though he was] Being, AUTH.

cause of the false brethren craftily brought in, men who came in stealthily to spy out our liberty which we have in Christ Jesus, that they might bring us into bondage: 5 to whom we gave place by our submission, no, not for an hour; that the truth of the Gospel might continue with 6 you. But from those who were high in reputation,— whatsoever they were, it maketh no matter to me; God accepteth no man's person,—to me certainly they who 7 were of reputation communicated nothing; but contrariwise, when they saw that I was entrusted with the Gospel of the uncircumcision, even as Peter was with 8 that of the circumcision, (for He that wrought for Peter

4. *The false, &c.] So RHEM.: false brethren unawares brought in, who, AUTH.; and that because of (certayne, Cov.) incommers beyng falce br., TYND., CRAN., BISH. Stealthily] Privily, AUTH., Cov. Test., CRAN., GEN., BISH.; omitted by WICL.; amonge other, TYND., Cov.; craftily, RHEM. Perhaps the change is desirable as avoiding repetition, and as harmonizing slightly better with the action described by the verb.*

5. *By our submission] By subiecction, AUTH., BISH.; to subieccion, WICL.; as concerning to be brought into subiecction, TYND., Cov., CRAN., GEN.; yelded not subiecction, RHEM.; omitted by Cov. Test.*

6. *From] As to them, Cov.; as for them, Cov. Test.; of these, AUTH., WICL.; of them, remaining Vv. The*

change here seems necessary to prevent of being considered a mere sign of the gen. case. Were high, &c.] Seemed to be somewhat, AUTH., WICL., CRAN., and sim. Cov. Test., RHEM.; that (which, GEN.) seemed (sene, TYND.) to be great, TYND., Cov., GEN. The very slight distinction between δοκούστε and δοκ. είναι τι, and the apparent ref. to the judgment of others (see notes), are

appy. both conveyed more nearly by this translation than by the more literal rendering of AUTH.

To me certainly, &c.] For they who seemed to be somewhat in conference added nothing to me, AUTH.; added nothynge, TYND., CRAN., BISH., RHEM.; taught me nothing, Cov.; avayled me nothing, Cov. (Test.); dyd communicat nothing with me, GEN.

7. *I was entrusted, &c.] The Gospel ... was committed unto me as the Gospel of the circumc. was unto Peter, AUTH., and sim. the other Vv. The change of order is made for the sake of keeping the emphasis on πεπλορευμα' see Meyer. Even as] As, AUTH. and all the other Vv. On the translation of καθώς, see notes on 1 Thess. i. 5 (Transl.).*

8. *Wrought] So WICL., Cov. Test., RHEM.: wrought effectually, AUTH.; was mighty, TYND., Cov., CRAN., GEN., BISH. The idea of effectual working, though to a considerable extent involved in ἐπεγένετο, is perhaps scarcely sufficiently prominent to be expressed definitely; see however notes on 1 Thess. ii. 13 (Transl.). For Peter] Similarly, To Peter, WICL.; in, AUTH., TYND., CRAN., BISH., RHEM.; with, Cov.; by, Cov. Test.,*

towards the apostleship of the circumcision, the same wrought for me also towards the Gentiles,) and became 9 aware of the grace that was given unto me, James and Cephas and John, who are accounted as pillars, gave to me and Barnabas right hands of fellowship; that we should be apostles unto the Gentiles, and they unto the circumcision. Only *they would* that we should remember 10 THE POOR; which very thing I also was forward to do.

But when Cephas came to Antioch, I withstood him to 11 the face, because he had been condemned. For before 12 that certain *men* came from James, he was eating with the Gentiles; but when they came, he began to withdraw and separate himself, fearing them *which were* of the circumcision. And the rest of the Jews also dis- 13

GEN. *Towards]* To, AUTH.,
Cov., BISH., RHEM.; into, WICL.; in,
TYND. and the remaining Vv.

Wrought] Was mighty in me toward,
AUTH. All the other Vv. give the
same translation to *ἐπεγένετο* in the
second clause that they adopt in the
first.

9. *And became aware, &c.]* Similarly, as to order, WICL., TYND., CRAN., BISH., RHEM., except that they repeat the idiomatic *when* in the translation of the temporal participle *γνώσσεις*, but thus slightly impair the natural sequence of the *ἰσούσσεις... καὶ γνώσσεις*. AUTH. inverts, and when *James, Cephas, and John, who seemed to be, &c.*; Cov. turns into a finite verb, *they perceived*. *And Cephas]* Similarly WICL., RHEM.: *and* is omitted by AUTH. and the remaining Vv.

Are accounted as] Weren
seynto be, WICL.; are taken to be,
GEN.; seemed to be, AUTH. and all the
other Vv.

Right hands] Right hand, WICL.; the right hands,
AUTH. and the other Vv.

Be apostles] So CRAN., BISH.: should
go, AUTH.; that we among the heathen,
WICL.; shuld preach, TYND., Cov.

both, GEN.; that we unto, RHEM.
Gentiles] So GEN., RHEM.: heathen,
AUTH. and the remaining Vv.

10. *Which very thing]* The same
which, AUTH.; the whiche thing,
WICL., Cov. Test. (*thing also*); whiche
thing also, TYND., Cov., GEN.; wher
in also, CRAN., BISH.; the which same
thing also, RHEM.

11. *Cephas]* *Peter, AUTH.
Came] So Cov. Test.: was come,
AUTH. and the remaining Vv.
Had been condemned] Was to be blamed,
AUTH., BISH.; was worthy to be blamed,
TYND., Cov., CRAN., GEN., and simi
larly, to be undirnomen, WICL.; was
blameable, Cov. Test.; was reprehensible,
RHEM.

12. *Was eating]* Did eat, AUTH.,
Cov. (both), CRAN., BISH., RHEM.;
ete, WICL., TYND., GEN. When
they came] were come, AUTH. and
other Vv. *Began to &c.]* With
drew and separated, AUTH. and all
Vv. The imperf. denotes the com
mencement and continuance of the
act, or as Bengel, *subducebat, paullatim*.

13. *The rest of the]* So Cov. Test.,
RHEM.: the other, AUTH. and the re-

sembled with him; insomuch that even Barnabas was
 14 carried away with *them* by their dissimulation. Howbeit
 when I saw that they were not walking uprightly accord-
 ing to the truth of the Gospel, I said unto Cephas before
 all, If thou, being a Jew, livest after the manner of Gen-
 tiles, and not as do the Jews, how *is it that* thou con-
 strainest the Gentiles to keep the customs of the Jews?
 15 WE *truly are* by nature Jews, and not sinners of the
 16 Gentiles; but as we know that a man is not justified by

maining Vv. *Also dissembled]*
Dissembled likewise, AUTH., TYND.,
 GEN., BISH.: the other Vv. omit the
 καὶ in translation. *Even Bar-
 nabas]* Barnabas also, AUTH.

With them] The σὺν of συνεπήκοη is
 not translated by AUTH. *By
 their]* With, AUTH.; into, WICL. and
 the remaining Vv.

14. *Howbeit]* But, AUTH. and all
 the other Vv. *Were not
 walking]* Walked not, AUTH.
Cephas] *Peter, AUTH. *All]*
 So Cov. (both), and similarly, all men,
 WICL, TYND., GEN.; *them all*, AUTH.,
 and the remaining Vv. *How
 cometh it, &c.]* *Why compellest thou?
 AUTH., and sim. *dost thou compel?*
 RHEM.; *hou constreynest thou?* WICL.;
why causeth thou? TYND., COV., CRAN.,
 GEN., BISH. *Keep the
 customs, &c.]* Judaize, RHEM.; *to live
 as do the Jews,* AUTH., and similarly
 the other Vv.

15. *We truly are, &c.]* Similarly
 RHEM.: *we who are Jews by nature,*
 AUTH., TYND., CRAN., GEN.; *though
 we be, &c.* Cov.; *we which are...know,*
 BISH. This address of St Paul to
 St Peter involves so many difficulties
 both in meaning and connexion, that
 it will be perhaps best to subjoin a
 free paraphrase of the whole. *We, I
 concede, are by birth Jews, not Gentiles
 and consequently from our point of
 view sinners; but as we know that a
 man is not justified by the works of the*

*law, in fact is not justified at all,
 except through faith in Christ; even
 we, with all our privileges, believed in
 and into Christ, that we might be justi-
 fied, &c. But what, if, while we are
 seeking to be justified in Christ the
 result show that we, with all our privi-
 leges, are sinners like the Gentiles? is
 Christ the minister of a dispensation
 that after all only leads to sin? God
 forbid! For if I (or you) build up
 again the system I pulled down, and
 set up nothing better in its place, it is
 thus, and not in seeking to be justified
 in Christ, that I show myself (vox hor-
 renda!) a transgressor of the law; yes,
 a violator of its deeper principles.
 For I (to adduce a proof from my own
 spiritual experience) through the me-
 dium of the law, and in accordance
 with its higher principles, died unto it
 in regard to its claims and its curse:
 I have been and am crucified with
 Christ. Though I live then, it is no
 longer as my old self, but as reani-
 mated by Christ; yes, the life which
 now I live, this earthly mundane life,
 I live in the element of faith in Christ,
 who so loved me that He gave His own
 life for me. Thus I do not, like these
 Judaists, regard the grace of God as
 a principle that could be dispensed
 with; for if, as they pretend, the law
 is sufficient to make men righteous, the
 obvious inference is that there was no
 object in the death of Christ.*

16. *But as we know]* *Knowing,

the works of the law, save *only* through faith in Jesus Christ,—we too believed in Christ Jesus, that we might be justified by faith in Christ, and not by the works of the law; since by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified. But if, while we seek to be justified in Christ, 17 we are found ourselves also to be sinners, *is* Christ therefore a minister of sin? God forbid! For if the things 18 that I destroyed THESE again I build up, I prove myself a transgressor. For I through the law died to the law, that 19 I might live unto God. I have been crucified with 20 Christ: it is however no longer I that live, but Christ

AUTH., WICL., Cov. Test., RHEM.;
we which...knowe, TYND., CRAN., GEN.,
 BISH.; *yet insomuche as we knewe*,
 Cov. *Save only through, &c.]*
Save by the faith by Jesus Christ, Cov.
 Test.; *but by the faith of (on, Cov.)*

J. C., AUTH. and the other Vv.
We too believed] Even we have believed
 in *J. C.*, AUTH.; and we billeuen,
 WICL.; we have believed also, Cov.;
 we also beleue, Cov. Test., RHEM.;
 and we have bel. on, CRAN., BISH.;
 and therfor we have, &c. TYND.; even
 we I say have bel. in, GEN.

Faith in] The faith of, AUTH. and all
 Vv. *Since]* For, AUTH.; because that, TYND., Cov. (both),
 CRAN., GEN.; wherfor, WICL.; be-
 cause, BISH.; for the which cause,
 RHEM.

17. *In Christ]* So WICL., Cov.
 Test., RHEM.: by Christ, AUTH. and
 remaining Vv. *We are found, &c.]*
We ourselves also are found sinners,
 AUTH. English idiom here, in con-
 sequence of the union with the pres.
 part., seems to require the pres. *are*
found as the translation of *εὑρέθησεν*.
 The aorist in the original has an idio-
 matic reference to a discovery past
 and done with, and about which no
 more need be said: this cannot be ex-
 pressed without paraphrase; comp.
 Donalds. Gr. § 433. *Is Christ, &c.]*

Is therefore Christ the, AUTH.

God forbid] So AUTH. and all Vv.
 except Cov. Test., *that be farre*. On re-
 consideration it would seem best, and
 even practically most exact, in a pas-
 sage of the present nature, where the
 revulsion of feeling and thought is
 very decided, to retain the familiar
 and idiomatic translation of AUTH.

18. *The things that I destroyed]*
I build again the things which I de-
stroyed, AUTH., CRAN., BISH.; *that*
which, TYND., Cov., GEN.; *the same*
things againe which, RHEM. The in-
 version, though involving a slight
 irregularity in structure, seems here
 needed, as serving both to keep the
 emphasis on the right words, and to
 exhibit the true point of the argument.
Prove myself] Make myself, AUTH.
 and all the other Vv.

19. *Died]* *Hauē bene deed*, CRAN.;
am dead, AUTH. and the other Vv.

20. *Have been crucified]* *Am cru-*
cified, AUTH., and similarly, as to the
 auxiliary, all the other Vv. Of the
 two modes of expressing the Greek
 perfect (*am* and *have been*) the latter
 seems here most appropriate, as the
 associated aor. renders the ref. to
 past time more prominent than one to
 present effects; see notes on Col. i. 16
 (Transl.). *It is however, &c.]*
Nevertheless I live; yet not I, AUTH.,

liveth in me; yea the life which now I live in the flesh
 I live in faith,—*faith* in the Son of God, who loved me,
 21 and gave Himself for me. I do not make void the grace
 of God; for if righteousness *come* THROUGH THE LAW,
 then for naught did Christ die.

III. O foolish Galatians, who did bewitch you, before whose
 eyes Jesus Christ was evidently set forth among you,
 2 CRUCIFIED. This only would I learn of you, Was it by
 the works of the law that ye received the Spirit, or by the
 3 hearing of faith? Are ye so very foolish? having begun
 with the Spirit are ye now being made perfect with the
 4 flesh? Did ye suffer so many things in vain? if indeed it
 5 really be in vain. He then, *I say*, that ministereth to
 you the Spirit and worketh mighty powers within you,

similarly COV., CRAN.; *I live verely,*
yet now not I, TYND., GEN. Yea]
 And, AUTH., GEN., BISH., RHEM.;
 for, TYND., COV.; but, WICL., COV.
 Test. Now *I* now, AUTH.
In faith, &c.] By (in, WICL., COV.
 (both), RHEM.) the *faith of*, AUTH.,
 TYND., CRAN., GEN., BISH.

21. *Make void]* Frustrate, AUTH.;
cast not awēi, WICL., COV. (both),
 RHEM.; *despyse not*, TYND., CRAN.;
do not abrogate, GEN.; *reject not*,
 BISH. Through] So WICL.:
by, AUTH., COV. (both), RHEM.; *of*,
 TYND., CRAN., GEN., BISH.

For naught] In vain, AUTH., TYND.,
 COV., CRAN., BISH., RHEM.; without
 cause, WICL.; *a cause*, GEN.

Did Christ die] Christ is dead, AUTH.,
 BISH.; died, WICL. and the remaining
 Vv. The slight change in the
 text seems to give the due prominence
 to *δωρεδ*, and also to preserve a
 better rhythm than the unresolved
died.

CHAPTER III. I. *Did bewitch]*
Hath bewitched, AUTH. and the other
 Vv. AUTH. inserts after you,

**that ye should not obey the truth.*

2. *Was it, &c.]* Similarly, *By the
 workes of the law did you receive,*
 RHEM.; *received ye the Spirit by the*,
&c. AUTH., and similarly as to order
 all the remaining Vv.

3. *So very]* So, AUTH. and the
 other Vv. except COV., such *fooles*.
Begun with] So RHEM.: *by*, COV.; *in*,
 AUTH. and the other Vv.
Being made perfect with] *Made perfect*
by, AUTH.; *in*, GEN.; *ben ended*,
 WICL.; *nose ende*, TYND., COV. Test.;
ende now then, COV.; *ende in*, TYND.,
 CRAN.; *be consummate with*, RHEM.

4. *Did ye suffer]* *Huve ye suffered*,
 AUTH., COV. (both), BISH., RHEM.,
 and similarly the other Vv., except
 that they do not adopt the interrogative
 form. *Indeed it really be]*
It be yet, AUTH., BISH.; *if that be
 wayne*, TYND., GEN.; *yf it be also in
 wayne*, CRAN.; *if yet without cause*,
 RHEM.

5. *He then, &c.]* *He therefore*,
 AUTH., COV. Test., GEN., BISH.,
 RHEM.; *moreover, he, &c.* CRAN.:
ow̄ is omitted in translation by WICL.,
 TYND., COV. *Mighty powers, &c.]*

doeth he it by the works of the law or by the hearing of faith?

Even as Abraham believed God, and it was accounted 6 to him for righteousness. Know ye then that THEY 7 WHICH ARE OF FAITH, the same are the sons of Abraham. Moreover the Scripture, foreseeing that God justifieth 8 the Gentiles by FAITH, proclaimed beforehand the glad tidings unto Abraham, *saying*, In thee shall all the nations BE BLESSED. So then they which be of faith are 9 blessed together with the faithful Abraham.

For as many as are of the works of the law are under 10 curse: for it is written, Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them. But further, that in the law no 11 man is justified in the sight of God, it is evident; because, The just shall live by FAITH. Now the law is not of faith; 12 but, He that doeth them shall live in them. Christ 13 redeemed us from the curse of the law, having become

Virtues in you, WICL.; *great actes*, Cov.; *miracles among you*, AUTH. and the other Vv.

7. *Then*] *Thus (ye know)*, Cov.; *so (ye know)*, GEN.; *therefore*, AUTH. and remaining Vv. The only other version that takes γνώσκετε indicatively is that of CRAN. Sons] So WICL.: *children*, AUTH. and the remaining Vv.

8. *Moreover*] *And*, AUTH., WICL., Cov. Test., RHEM.; *for*, TYND. and remaining Vv.: omitted by Cov.

Justifieth] So WICL., Cov. Test., RHEM.: *would justify*, AUTH., TYND., CRAN., GEN.; *justified*, Cov.

The Gentiles] So GEN., RHEM.: *the heathen*, AUTH. and the remaining Vv. *By faith*] So Cov. Test., RHEM., and sim. of *bileue*, WICL.: *through faith*, AUTH. and the remaining Vv. *Proclaimed beforehand*, &c.] Sim. TYND., Cov., CRAN.: *preached before (before hand*, GEN.) *the Gospel*, AUTH.; *told to for*, WICL.; *told*, Cov. Test.; *shewed*

...*before*, RHEM. All the nations] Sim. alle the hethen, WICL., Cov.; all the Gentiles, GEN.; all nations, AUTH. and the remaining Vv. The change in the translation of τὰ ἔθνη in the same verse seems required by a kind of chronological propriety.

9. *Together with*] *With*, AUTH. and all the other Vv. The faithful] So BISH., RHEM.: *faithful*, AUTH. and all the remaining Vv.

10. *Curse*] So WICL., RHEM., and similarly, *under malediccion*, TYND.; *the curse*, AUTH., Cov. (both), CRAN., GEN., BISH.

11. *But further, &c.*] *But that no man is justified by the law*, AUTH. Because] So RHEM.: *for*, AUTH. and the remaining Vv.

12. *Now*] *And*, AUTH., Cov. Test., GEN., BISH.; *but*, WICL., RHEM.; omitted by TYND., Cov., CRAN.

He] **The man*, AUTH.

13. *Redeemed*] Sim. *agenbought*, WICL.; *hath delivered*, TYND., CRAN.,

A CURSE for us,—because it is written, Cursed *is* every
 14 one that hangeth on a tree,—that unto the Gentiles the
 blessing of Abraham might come in Christ Jesus; that
 we might receive the promise of the Spirit THROUGH
 FAITH.

15 Brethren, I speak after the manner of men; though it be
 but a MAN'S covenant, yet when it hath been confirmed,
 16 no man annulleth it, or addeth new conditions. Now to
 Abraham were the promises made, AND TO HIS SEED. He
 saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And
 17 to thy seed, which is Christ. Now this I say, a covenant,
 that hath been before confirmed by God [for Christ], the
 law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, doth
 not invalidate, that it should make void the promise.
 18 For if the inheritance *be* of the law, *it is* no more of pro-
 mise: but to Abraham God hath freely given it THROUGH
 PROMISE.

Cov.; *hath redeemed*, AUTH. and re-
 maining Vv. *Having become]*
Being made, AUTH., BISH., RHEM.;
and was made, WICL., TYND.; *when*
he became, Cov.; *beynge become*, Cov.
 Test.; *in as moch as he was made*
 CRAN.; *when he was made*, GEN.
Because] So RHEM.: *for*, AUTH. and
 the remaining Vv.

14. *Unto the Gentiles]* Come on the
 Gentiles, AUTH. In Christ J.]
 So WICL., Cov. (both), RHEM.; through
 *J.C., AUTH., TYND., CRAN., (Chr.
 Jes.) GEN., BISH.

15. *Yet when it hath been]* Yet if
 it *be*, AUTH. The temporal transla-
 tion in the text is adopted by TYND.,
 Cov.; the hypothetical by AUTH. with
 CRAN., BISH.: the remaining Vv.
 adopt purely participial translations.
Annulleth it, &c.] Disannulleth or
addeth thereto, AUTH., BISH.; *ordeyn-*
eth above, WICL.; *addeth eny thinge*
thereto, TYND., Cov. (sim. Test.),
 CRAN., GEN.; *further disposeth*, RHEM.

16. *To Abraham were the, &c.]*

Sim. order in WICL., RHEM.: *and his*
seed were the promises, &c. AUTH. and
 the remaining Vv.

17. *Now this]* And this, AUTH.,
 GEN., RHEM.; but, WICL., Cov. Test.;
 & is omitted by TYND., Cov., BISH.
 The translation of & is here somewhat
 difficult. Though now has just pre-
 ceded, it must appy. be adopted again
 as the only transl. which seems to
 preserve the resumptive force.

A covenant] This cov., WICL., Cov.
 (both); the cov., AUTH. and remaining
 Vv. *Hath been before con-*

firmed] Was confirmed before, AUTH.,
 TYND., Cov., CRAN., GEN.; was given,
 Cov. Test.; the testament being confirm-
 ed, RHEM.; wholly inverted by WICL.
By God, &c.] Of God in Christ, AUTH.
Doth not, &c.] Sim. TYND., CRAN.,
 BISH.: cannot disannul, AUTH., GEN.;
makith not...veyn, WICL.; *is not dis-*
annulled, Cov.; *makith not void*,
 RHEM.; confused in Cov. Test.

Make void] Similarly, To avoids away,
 WICL., Cov. Test.: make the promise of

What then is *the object of the law?* It was added because of the transgressions, till the Seed should come to whom the promise hath been made; *and was* ordained by means of angels, in the hand of a mediator. Now a mediator is not a *mediator* of one, but God is one. *Is* the law then against the promises of GOD? God forbid! for if there had been given a law which could have given life, verily by the law would righteousness have come. But on the contrary, the scripture shut up all under sin, that the promise by faith in Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe. Now before that faith came, we were kept in ward shut up under the law for the faith which afterwards was to be revealed. So then the law

none effect, AUTH., TYND., COV., CRAN., GEN., BISH.; *to frustrate*, RHEM.

18. *But to Abraham, &c.] But God grauntidide to A., WICL.; gave freely*, COV.; *gave it to A. by promise*, AUTH. and remaining Vv.

Through] Thorough beheest, WICL.; *by*, AUTH. and all the other Vv.

19. *What then, &c.] Wherefore then serveth*, AUTH., TYND., COV. (sim. TEST.), CRAN., GEN., BISH.; *what thanne the lawe*? WICL.; *why was the law then*? RHEM.

The transgressions] AUTH. and all the other Vv. omit the article: in a passage however of this dogmatical importance it ought appy. to be retained.

Hath been made] Was made, AUTH., TYND., CRAN., GEN.; *He hadde made biheest*, WICL.; *He had promised*, COV. TEST., RHEM. *And was] And it was*, AUTH. *By means of] Of*, COV.; *by*, AUTH. and the other Vv.

21. *Given a law] A law given*, AUTH. *Verily by the, &c.] Verily (WICL.) righteousness should have been by the law*, AUTH.; *then no doute*, TYND., COV., CRAN., GEN., BISH.; *shuld have come*, TYND., (om. *have*) CRAN., GEN.

22. *But on the contrary] But*,

AUTH. and all the other Vv. The addition of the words *on the contrary* seems here required in translation to preserve the true force of διαντίς, and to show clearly the nature of the reasoning. *Shut up all] Similarly, as to the omission of hath concluded all things*, TYND., CRAN.; *hath concluded all*, AUTH., BISH.; *hath concludid alle thingis*, WICL., GEN., RHEM. *Faith in] Faith on*, COV.; *faith of*, AUTH. and the other Vv.

23. *Now] And*, WICL.; *but*, AUTH. and other Vv.: δέ is omitted by TYND., COV.

Before that] So

TYND., CRAN., and similarly, *to for that*, WICL.; *afore that*, COV. TEST.; *before*, AUTH. and the remaining Vv.

Kept in ward, &c.] Kept under the law, shut up, AUTH.; *kept undir the lawe, enclosid*, WICL.; *kept and shut up, &c.* TYND., COV., GEN.; *kept under the lawe and were shut up*, CRAN., BISH.

For] Unto, AUTH. *Afterwards was, &c.] Which should afterwards be rev.*, AUTH., GEN., BISH.; similarly, *be declared*, TYND., COV., CRAN.

24. *So then] Wherefore*, AUTH., TYND., CRAN., GEN., BISH.; *and so*,

hath been our schoolmaster unto Christ, that we may be justified BY FAITH.

25 But now that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster. For ye are all sons of God through the faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as were baptized into Christ put on Christ. There is among such neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is no male and female: for ye all are one man in Christ Jesus. But if ye be Christ's, then are ye ABRAHAM'S SEED, heirs according to promise.

IV. Now I say, That the heir, as long as he is a child, differeth in nothing from a bond-servant, though he be lord

WICL.; *thus*, Cov.; therefore, Cov. Test., RHEM. *Hath been our schoolmaster unto]* Was our schoolmaster to bring us unto, AUTH., GEN.; undir-maistir in Crist, WIUL.; scolemaster unto the tyme of, TYND.; scolemaster unto, Cov. (both), CRAN., BISH.; pedagogue in, RHEM. There is much difficulty in fixing on the most suitable translation of this word. The term *schoolmaster* certainly tends to introduce an idea (that of teaching) not in the original, and also serves to obscure the idea of *custodia (custo incorruptissimus)*, Hor. Sat. I. 6. 81, which seems the prevailing one of the passage. Still as the same objection applies in a greater or less degree to *pedagogue* (ed. 1) and *tutor*, it will be perhaps better, in so familiar a passage, to return to AUTH. *May be]* So RHEM.; *might be*, AUTH.: change to preserve what is called the succession of tenses: Latham, *Engl. Lang.* § 616 (ed. 3).

25. *Now that]* So Cov.: *when the faith did come*, Cov. Test.; *when the faith came*, RHEM.; *after that*, AUTH. and remaining Vv.

26. *Sons]* The sonnes, TYND., GEN.; *the children*, AUTH. and the remaining Vv. *Through the faith]* By faith, AUTH., GEN., BISH., RHEM.;

thorugh beleue, WICL.; by the fayth which is in, TYND., Cov. Test.; because ye beleue in, CRAN.

27. *Were baptized]* Have been baptized, AUTH.; are baptized, TYND. (ben, WICL.), and all the remaining Vv. *Put on]* Ben clothid, WICL.; have put on, AUTH. and the other Vv.

28. *There is among such, &c.]* There is neither, &c. AUTH. No male and female] Neither male nor female, AUTH. None of the other Vv. seem to have marked the change. *Ye all are]* Alle ye ben, WICL.; al you are, RHEM.; are all, AUTH. and remaining Vv. *One man]* One thinge, TYND.; one, AUTH. and remaining Vv.

29. *But]* So Cov. Test.: and, AUTH., WICL., RHEM. The rest omit the particle. *Heirs]* So RHEM.: * and heirs, AUTH.

CHAPTER IV. 1. *In nothing]* Nothing, AUTH., WICL., Cov. Test., BISH., RHEM.; differth not, TYND., CRAN., GEN.; there is no diff., Cov. *Bond-servant]* Servant, AUTH. and all the other Vv. It seems desirable to keep up the idea of bondage and slavery which pervades the whole simile.

of all; but is under guardians and stewards until the time 2 appointed of the father. Even so we, when we were chil- 3 dren, were kept in bondage under the rudiments of the world: but when the fulness of the time came, God sent 4 forth His Son, born of a woman, born under the law, that He might redeem them that were under the law, 5 that we might receive the adoption of sons. And to show 6 that ye ARE SONS, God sent forth the Spirit of His Son into our hearts, crying, Abba Father. So then thou art 7 no more a servant, but a son; and if a son, an heir also through God.

Howbeit at that time truly, not knowing God, ye were 8 in bondage to them which by nature are not gods. But 9 now that ye have come to know God, or rather have been

2. *Guardians and stewards]* *Kepers and tutores*, WICL.; *rulers and governors*, Cov.; *tutors and governors*, AUTH. and other Vv. It seems desirable to make a change in translation, to preserve a distinction between *τηρητοις* (*guardians*) here and *ταυδηγων* in ch. iii. 24, 25.

3. *Kept in bondage]* *Serueden undir*, WICL.; *were seruing under*, Cov. Test., RHEM.; *were in bondage under*, AUTH. and the other Vv. *Rudiments]* *So GEN., BISH.: elements*, AUTH., WICL., RHEM.; *ordinances*, TYND., CRAN.; *tradicions*, Cov. (both).

4. *Came]* *So WICL., RHEM.: was come*, AUTH., and sim. the remaining Vv. *Born...born]* *Made...made*, AUTH., WICL., RHEM., (and made under), BISH.; *born...made bonde unto*, TYND., CRAN.; *borne and put under*, Cov.; *made...made bonde unto*, GEN. The meaning preferred by Scholef. (*Hints*, p. 96), *made subject to the law*, involves a change of meaning in *γενόμενον* which does not appear necessary or natural.

5. *That He might]* *So RHEM., and similarly WICL., Cov. Test.: to re-deem*, AUTH. and the remaining Vv.

Here, as in ch. iii. 14, it seems most exact to indicate the repeated *ba* by the same form of translation.

6. *To show that]* *For ye ben*, WICL.; *forsomuche then as*, Cov.; *because*, AUTH. and the other Vv.

Sent forth] Similarly, *Sente*, WICL., Cov. Test.; *hath sent forth*, AUTH.; *hath sent*, TYND., Cov., CRAN., RHEM.; *hath sent out*, GEN. *Our hearts]*

**Your hearts*, AUTH.

7. *So then]* *Wherefore*, AUTH., GEN., BISH.; *and so*, WICL.; *wherefore now*, TYND., Cov., CRAN.; *therefore*, Cov. Test., RHEM. *An heir, &c.] Then an heir *of God through Christ*, AUTH.

8. *At that time, &c.] Then when ye knew not*, AUTH.; *thanne ye un-knowyng*, WICL.; *when ye kneve not*, TYND., Cov., CRAN., GEN., BISH.; *but then truely not knowyng*, Cov. Test.; *then in deede not knowing*, RHEM. The change in the transl. of *τότε* is to prevent *then* being mistaken for the inferential particle. *Were in bondage]* *Ye did service*, AUTH.

Not gods] **No gods*, AUTH.

9. *Now that ye have come to know]* *Now after that ys have known*, AUTH.

known by God, how *is it that* ye turn back again to the weak and beggarly rudiments, whereunto ye desire to be 10 again anew in bondage? Ye are carefully observing days 11 and months and seasons and years. I am apprehensive of you, lest haply I have bestowed upon you labour in vain.

12 Brethren, I beseech you, become as I *am*, for I also 13 have become as ye are. Ye injured me in nothing: yea ye know that it was on account of weakness of my flesh 14 that I preached the Gospel unto you the first time; and your temptation in my flesh ye despised not, nor loathed, but received me as an angel of God, *yea* as Christ Jesus. 15 Of what nature then *was* the boasting of your blessed-

Have been known] *Are taught*, GEN.; *are known*, AUTH. and the other Vv. *By God]* *Of God*, AUTH. and all the other Vv. *How is it that]* So TYND., COV., CRAN., GEN.: *how*, AUTH., WICL., COV. TEST., BISH., RHEM. *Ye turn back]* So COV.: *ben ye turned*, WICL.; *ye are tourned backwarde unto*, GEN.; *turn ye*, AUTH. and the other Vv. *Rudiments]* So BISH.: *elements*, AUTH., WICL., RHEM.; *cerimonies*, TYND., GEN.; *tradicions*, COV. (both); *ordinacunes*, CRAN. *Again anew]* Similarly, *Agayne...afresh*, TYND., COV., CRAN., BISH.: *again*, AUTH., and similarly COV. TEST., RHEM.; *as from the begynnyng ye wil be in bondage backwardly*, GEN.

10. *Are carefully observing]* *Ye taken kepe to*, WICL.; *observe*, AUTH. and the other Vv. *Seasons]* *Times*, AUTH. and all the other Vv.

11. *Am apprehensive]* *Am afraid*, AUTH.; *dred*, WICL.; *am in feare of*, TYND., COV., CRAN., GEN., BISH.; *feare me*, COV. TEST.; *fear*, RHEM.

12. *Become as, &c.] Be as I am*; *for I am as ye are: ye have not injured me at all*, AUTH., BISH.; *ye have not hurte me at all*, TYND., COV.,

CRAN., GEN.

13. *Ye know, &c.] Ye knowe that by infirmyte*, WICL., RHEM.; *in weakness*, COV.; *through infirm.*, AUTH. and the other Vv. The slight changes made by substituting the simpler word *weakness* for *infirmyte*, and *my* for *the*, seem to make the Apostle's reference to some bodily affliction or illness rather more apparent.

The first time] *Now bifor*, WICL.; *a whyle ago*, COV. TEST.; *at the first*, AUTH. and the other Vv.; this translation leaves the meaning ambiguous; see notes.

14. *Your]* **My*, AUTH.; see notes. *In my flesh]* So WICL., COV. TEST., RHEM.; *which was in*, AUTH., CRAN., GEN., BISH., and similarly TYND.

Loathed] *Rejected*, AUTH., RHEM.; *forsaken*, WICL.; *abhorred*, TYND., CRAN., GEN., BISH. *Yea]* So TYND., COV. TEST., GEN.: *even*, AUTH., COV., CRAN., BISH.; omitted by WICL., RHEM.

15. *Of what nature, &c.] Where is then the blessednes ye speake of?* AUTH.; *your blesсынге*, WICL.; *how happy were ye then?* TYND., COV.; *your happynesse*, COV. TEST.; *your felicite*, CRAN., BISH.; *boasting of your fel.*

ness? for I bear you record, that, if it had been possible, ye would have plucked out your eyes, and have given them to me. So then am I become your enemy by speaking to you the truth?

They pay you court, in no honest way; yea, they desire to exclude you, that ye may pay THEM court. But it is good to be courted in honesty AT ALL TIMES, and not only when I am present with you. My little children, of whom I am again in travail, until Christ be formed in you, I could indeed wish to be present with you now, and to change my tone, for I am perplexed about you.

Tell me ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law? For it is written that Abraham had two sons; one by the bond-maid, and one by the freewoman. Howbeit he who was of the bond-maid was born after the flesh; but he of the free-maid was through the pro-

GEN.; your blessedness, RHEM.
Your eyes] So WICL., COV. TEST.,
RHEM.: your own, AUTH. and the remaining Vv.

16. So then am I] Am I thanne, WICL., RHEM.; am I therefore, AUTH. and the other Vv. [By speaking] Seiyng, WICL.; telling, COV. TEST., RHEM.; because I tell, AUTH. and the other Vv.

17. Pay you court, &c.] Zelously affect you but not well, AUTH.; louen not you well, WICL.; are gelous over you amysse, TYND., COV., CRAN., GEN., BISH.; emulate, RHEM.
Desire to] Would, AUTH., WICL., COV., RHEM.; intende to, TYND., CRAN., GEN., BISH.; wyll, COV. TEST. May pay them court] Might affect them, AUTH.

18. To be courted, &c.] To be zealously affected alwayes in a good thing, AUTH.; to be fervent, TYND., COV., CRAN.; to love earnestly, GEN.; to be zealous, BISH.

19. Am again] Travaile in birth againe, AUTH.

20. I could indeed wish] I desire, AUTH.; but I desire, BISH.; I wolde I were, TYND., COV., CRAN., GEN., and similarly the remaining Vv.
Tone] Voyce, AUTH. and all the other Vv.
Am perplexed, &c.] I stand in doubt of you, AUTH., and similarly TYND., COV., CRAN., GEN., BISH.; am ashamed of you, COV. TEST.; am confoundid, WICL., RHEM.

22. One...and one] So WICL., RHEM.: the one...and one, COV. TEST.; the one...the other, AUTH. and the remaining Vv. The bond-maid...the free-woman] Similarly RHEM.: a bondmaid...a freewoman, AUTH., and similarly the remaining Vv.

23. Howbeit] But, AUTH., WICL., COV. TEST., RHEM.; yee and, TYND., CRAN., GEN.; omitted by COV.
Bondmaid] Bondwoman, AUTH.
Through] After, COV. TEST.; by, AUTH., and similarly the remaining Vv.

24 mise. All which things are allegorical ; for these women
 are two covenants,—the one from Mount Sinai, bearing
 25 children unto bondage ; and this is Agar ; (for the word
 Agar signifieth in Arabia Mount Sinai;) and she ranketh
 with Jerusalem which now is, for she is in bondage with
 26 her children. But Jerusalem which is above is free, AND
 27 SHE is our mother. For it is written, Rejoice, thou
 barren that bearest not; break forth and cry, thou that
 travailest not : for many children hath the desolate one,
 28 more than she which hath an husband. But ye, brethren,
 29 as Isaac was, are children of PROMISE. Still as then he
 that was born after the flesh persecuted him *that was*
 30 *born* after the Spirit, even so *it is* now. Nevertheless
 what saith the scripture? Cast out the bond-maid and
 her son: for the son of the bond-maid shall in no wise BE
 31 HEIR with the son of the free-woman. Wherefore, brethren,
 we are not children of a bond-maid, but of the free-

24. *All which, &c.] Which things are an Allegorie, AUTH.; ben seide bi another understandinge, WICL.; betoken mystery, TYND.; betoken somewhat, Cov.; are spoken by an alleg., CRAN., and similarly Cov. Test., RHEM.; by the which thinges another thing is ment, GEN., BISH. These women] So TYND., Cov.: these mothers, GEN.; these, AUTH. and the remaining Vv. Two]*
** The two, AUTH. Bearing children, &c.] Gendrynge, WICL., RHEM.; engendryng, Cov. Test.; which gendereth to, AUTH. and the other Vv.*
And this] Which, AUTH. and all Vv.

25. *The word, &c.] This Agar is Mount Sinai in Arabia, AUTH., (the mount) BISH.; for mounte S. is called A. in Arab., TYND.; for Agar is called in Arabia the Mount Sina, Cov.; for Sina is a mountaine in Ar., GEN., Cov. Test., RHEM. Ranketh with] Answereth to, AUTH., GEN.; is ioyned to it, WICL., Cov. Test.; bordereth upon, TYND., CRAN., BISH. (see notes); reacheth unto, Cov.; hath*

*affinitie to, RHEM. For she is] * And is, AUTH.*

26. *And she, &c.] Which is the mother of us * all, AUTH.*

27. *For many children, &c.] Similarly RHEM.: for the desolate hath many moe children then she which hath, AUTH. An husband] So AUTH. and all the other Vv. Idiom seems to require this less accurate translation.*

28. *But ye] Now * wee, AUTH. Children] So TYND., GENEV.: sones, WICL.; the children, AUTH. and the remaining Vv.*

29. *Still] But, AUTH. and all the other Vv.*

30. *Bond-maid (bis)] Bondwoman, AUTH. Shall in no wise] So BISH. (ed. 2): shall not, AUTH. and all the other Vv. This seems one of the cases in which we may press the translation of οὐ μή see notes on 1 Thess. iv. 15 (Transl.).*

31. *Wherefore] *So then, AUTH. A bond-maid] The seruaunt, WICL.;*

woman. Stand fast then in the liberty for which Christ V. made us free, and be not held fast again in a yoke of bondage.

Behold, I Paul say unto you, that if ye be circumcised, 2 CHRIST will profit you nothing. Yea I testify again to 3 every man who has himself circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the WHOLE law. Ye have been done away 4 with from Christ, whosoever of you are being justified in the law; ye are fallen away from grace. For we, by the 5 Spirit, are tarrying for the hope of righteousness from faith. For in Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth 6

the bondwoman, AUTH. and all the other Vv. *Free-woman*] *Free*, AUTH.

CHAPTER V. 1. *Then*] Therefore, AUTH. and other Vv.; omitted by WICL., RHEM. *For which*] *Wherewith*, AUTH., TYND., CRAN., BISH.: a different reading is followed by WICL., GEN., RHEM. *Made us*] *Hath made*, AUTH. *Held fast*, &c.] *Intangled againe with the*, AUTH.; *wrappe not youre selves agayne in the*, TYND., CRAN., and similarly COV., GEN.; *be not holden with*, COV. TEST., RHEM., similarly WICL.

2. *Will*] (present) COV.; shall, AUTH. and the other Vv.; simple predication of result: *In primis personis shall simpliciter praedicentis est*; *will quasi promittentis aut minantis*; *in secundis et tertius personis shall promittentis est aut minantis*, *will simpliciter praedicentis*: Wallis, Gr. Angl. p. 106.

3. *Yea*] *For*, AUTH., GEN., BISH.; and, WICL., COV. TEST., RHEM.; omitted by TYND., COV., CRAN.

Who has himself, &c.] *That is circumcised*, AUTH., and similarly TYND., COV., CRAN., GEN., BISH.; *circumcidid hym silf*, WICL.; similarly COV. TEST., RHEM.

4. *Ye have*, &c.] *Christ is become*

of no effect unto you, AUTH.; and *ye ben voidid awie fro*, WICL.; *ye are gone quyte from*, TYND., COV., GEN.; *Christ is come but in veyne unto you*, CRAN., BISH.; *you are evacuated from*, RHEM. Here idiom seems to require the English perfect: the pure aoristic translation, *ye were done away with from Christ*, stands in too marked a contrast with the following present, and to the English reader too completely transfers the action to what is purely past: see notes on 1 Thess. ii. 16 (Transl.).

Are being justified] *Wyll be made ryghteous*, COV.; *are made ryghteous*, COV. TEST.; *are justified*, AUTH. and the other Vv. *In the*] So WICL., RHEM.: *by the*, AUTH. and the remaining Vv.

Fallen away] *Fallen*, AUTH.

5. *By the Spirit*, &c.] *Through the Spirit waite for the hope of right by faith*, AUTH., BISH.; *we loke for and hope in the sprite to be justified thorowf.*, TYND., CRAN.; *in the sprite of hope to be made ryghtuous by faith*, COV.; *in sprite by faythe we wayte for*, COV. TEST.; *we wayte for (by the Spirit through faith) the hope of the r.*, GEN. *Are tarrying for*] *Wait for*, AUTH., COV. TEST., GEN., BISH.; *abiden*, WICL.; *loke for*, TYND., CRAN.; *wayte*, COV.; *expect*, RHEM.

any thing, nor uncircumcision, but faith working through love.

7 Ye were running well; who did hinder you that ye
8 should not obey the truth? The persuasion *cometh* not
9 of Him that calleth you. A little leaven leaveneth the
10 whole lump. I, for my part, have confidence in you in
the Lord, that ye will be none otherwise minded; but he
that troubleth you shall bear his judgment, whosoever he
11 be. But I, brethren, if I still preach CIRCUMCISION, why
do I still suffer persecution? then is the offence of the
12 cross done away with. I would that they who are un-
settling you would even cut themselves off from you.

13 For ye were called unto liberty, brethren; only *use* not
your liberty for an occasion to the flesh, but by your love

6. *Working]* *That worchith*, WICL.,
RHEM.; *which by loue is mighty in*
operacion, TYND.; *which worketh*, AUTH.
and other Vv. The practice
of inserting the relative before the
anarthrous participle, even when idiom
can scarcely be urged in its favour,
is an inaccuracy that is not uncom-
monly found in the older Vv. Per-
haps even in Eph. ii. 1, Col. ii. 13,
it might seem better to adopt the con-
cessive translation, *though*, &c. see
however notes in locc. (*Transl.*).
Through] *By*, AUTH. and all the other
Vv.

7. *Were running]* *Did run*, AUTH.,
TYND., COV., CRAN., GEN., BISH.;
runnen, WICL.; *ranne*, COV. (both),
RHEM.

8. *The]* CRAN., RHEM.: *this*,
AUTH., WICL., COV. TEST., GEN.; *that*,
TYND.; *such*, COV. *That calleth]*
So rightly AUTH.: *not called*, TYND.,
GEN.; or *is calling*, as the iterative
force involved in the English present
more nearly approaches to the idio-
matic use of the participle than either
the past tense or the resolved present;
comp. notes on Phil. iii. 14 (*Transl.*),
and Latham, *Engl. Lang.* § 578 (ed. 3).

10. *I for my part]* *I*, AUTH. and
all the other Vv. *In]* So the other
Vv. except (*through the*) AUTH., GEN.

11. *But I]* So COV. TEST.: *and I*,
AUTH. *Still (bis)]* Yet, AUTH.
Done away with] *Voidid*, WICL.; *eva-*
cuated, RHEM.; *ceased*, AUTH. and
the other Vv.

12. *Are unsettling]* *Disturblen*,
WICL.; *do disquiet*, GEN.; *trouble*,
AUTH. and the other Vv.

Would even, &c.] *I would they were*
even cut off which trouble you, AUTH.,
and similarly RHEM.; *kutte awie*,
WICL., COV. TEST.; *were separated*,
TYND., CRAN.; *were roted out*, COV.;
were cut of from you, GEN.

13. *For ye, &c.]* *For brethren ye*
have been, &c., AUTH., and sim. all the
other Vv. as to the forward position
of *brethren*. The aor. *ἐκλήθητε* is
translated by different auxiliaries, *ye*
ben, WICL.; *are*, COV. (both), RHEM.;
were, TYND., CRAN.; *have been*, GEN.,
BISH., AUTH. *Your liberty]*

So TYND., COV. (both), CRAN., GEN.:
liberty, AUTH., BISH.; *freedom*, WICL.;
this libertie, RHEM. *Your*

love] *The love*, COV.; *charite*, WICL.,
RHEM.; *love*, AUTH. and the other Vv.

serve one another. For the whole law is fulfilled in one 14 saying, *even* in this, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. But if ye bite and devour one another, take 15 heed that ye be not consumed one of another.

Now I say, Walk by the Spirit, and ye shall in no wise 16 fulfil the lust of the flesh. For the flesh lusteth against 17 the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh: for these are opposed the one to the other, that ye may not do the things ye may wish. But if ye be led by the Spirit, ye 18 are not under the law. Now the works of the flesh are 19 manifest, of which kind are,—fornication, uncleanness, wantonness, idolatry, sorcery, hatreds, strife, jealousy, 20 *deeds of wrath*, caballings, dissensions, factions, envyings, 21 murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such like: of the which I tell you beforehand, as I also told *you* before-

14. *The whole]* *Eueri lave*, WICL.;
all the, AUTH. and the other Vv.

Saying] *Word*, AUTH. and all the other Vv.

15. *That ye be]* *Ye be*, AUTH.

16. *Now I say]* *This I say then*, AUTH.; *I saye*, TYND., COV., CRAN.; and *I seie*, WICL.; *then I say*, GEN., BISH.

By] *In the*, AUTH. and other Vv.: the article is omitted by WICL., COV. TEST. *Shall in no wise]* *Shall not*, AUTH., COV. TEST., GEN., BISH.; *ye schulen not parfourme*, WICL.; and *fulfill not* (imper.), TYND., CRAN.; *so shall ye not fulfyll*, COV.; *you shal not accomplish*, RHEM.

17. *For these]* **And*, AUTH.
Are opposed] *Ben adversaries*, WICL., RHEM.; *are contrary*, AUTH. and the other Vv. *That ye may not]* Comp. *that ye don not*, WICL.: *that the thynges that ye will, ye do not the same*, COV. TEST.; *that not what things soever you wil, these you doe*, RHEM.; *so that ye cannot do, &c.*, AUTH. and the remaining Vv. *Ye may wish]* *The things that ye would*, AUTH.; *the same things*, GEN.; *that ye willen*,

WICL.; *that which ye wolde*, TYND., COV.; *the thynges that ye wyll*, COV. TEST.; *whatsoever ye wolde*, CRAN.; *what ye wolde*, BISH.; *what things soever you wil*, RHEM.

18. *By]* So WICL., COV. TEST., RHEM.: *of*, AUTH. and the remaining Vv.

19. *Of which kind are]* *Whiche ben*, WICL., COV. TEST., GEN., RHEM.; *which are these*, AUTH. and remaining Vv. *Fornication]* **Adultery, fornication*, AUTH. *Wantonness]* So TYND., CRAN., GEN.: *lecherie*, WICL., COV. TEST., RHEM.; *lasciviousnesse*, AUTH.

20. *Sorcery, &c.]* *Witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies*, AUTH., GEN.; *witchecraft, hatred, variaunce, zeale... sectes*, TYND., CRAN., BISH.

21. *Tell you beforehand]* *I seie to you*, WICL.; *I foretel you*, RHEM.; *tell you before*, AUTH. and the other Vv. *Told you beforehand]* *Hau* also tolde you in time past, AUTH.; *hau* tolde you to for, WICL.; *hau* tolde you in tyme past, TYND., COV.,

hand, that they which do all such things shall not inherit
 22 the kingdom of God. But the fruit of the Spirit is love,
 joy, peace, longsuffering, benevolence, goodness, trustful-
 23 ness, meekness, temperance: against all such things
 24 there is no law. Now they that are Christ's have cruci-
 25 fied the flesh with the affections and lusts. If WE LIVE
 26 by the Spirit, let us also walk by the Spirit. Let us not
 become vainglorious, provoking one another, envying one
 another.

VI. Brethren, if a man should be even surprised in a fault,
 ye which are spiritual restore such an one in the spirit of
 meekness; considering thyself, lest thou also be tempted.
 2 Bear ye one another's burdens, and thus shall ye fulfil
 3 the law of Christ. For if a man think himself to be
 something, when he is nothing, he deceiveth his own
 4 mind. But let each man prove his own WORK, and then
 shall he have his ground of boasting only in what con-

CRAN.; *haue tolde you*, GEN., BISH.;

haue foretold you, RHEM.

All such things] Such things, AUTH. and the other Vv.; but *things* is omitted by Cov. (both).

22. *Benevolence*] *Gentilenesse*, AUTH., TYND., Cov., CRAN., GEN., BISH.; *benyngnyte*, WICL., RHEM.

Trustfulness] *Faythfulnes*, TYND., Cov., CRAN.; *faith*, AUTH. and the other Vv.

23. All such things] *Suche thingis*, WICL.; *such*, AUTH. and the other Vv.

24. Now they] *And they*, AUTH., WICL., RHEM.; *but*, Cov. (both); *for*, GEN.; *they truly*, BISH.; omitted by TYND., CRAN. *Have crucified*]

So AUTH. and all the other Vv. Here again it seems desirable to preserve the perfect in translation, as the English aor. tends to refer the crucifixion too exclusively to the past; see notes on ver. 4.

25. By the...by the] So *Bi Spirit*, WICL.; *in the...in the*, AUTH. and the

remaining Vv.

26. *Become*] So Cov. Test.: *be*, AUTH., TYND., Cov., CRAN., GEN., BISH.; *be made*, WICL., RHEM.

Vainglorious] So TYND., Cov.: *couer-
tous of veyne glorie*, WICL.; *desirous
of vaine glory*, AUTH. and the remaining Vv.

CHAPTER VI. 1. Should be even surprised] *Bee overtaken*, AUTH., Cov. (both); *be occupied*, WICL.; *be fallen by chaunce*, TYND.; *be taken*, CRAN.; *be fallen by occasion*, GEN., BISH.; *be preoccupied*, RHEM.

2. Thus shall ye, &c.] So you shall fulfil, RHEM.; *so* fulfil*, AUTH., TYND., CRAN., GEN.

3. *Deceiveth his own mind*] So CRAN.: *deceiveth himselfe*, AUTH., Cov. (both); *bigilith hym silf*, WICL.; *deceaveth hym silfe in his ymaginacion*, TYND., GEN.; *in his own fansie*, BISH.; *seduceth him self*, RHEM.

4. *Each*] So WICL.; *every*, AUTH. and the remaining Vv. His

cerneth himself, and not in what concerneth the other.

For each man must bear his own load.

5

But let him that is taught in the word share with him 6
that teacheth in all good things. Be not deceived; God 7
is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall
he also reap. For he that soweth unto his own flesh 8
shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth
unto the Spirit shall of the Spirit reap eternal life. But 9
let us not lose heart in well-doing; for in due season we
shall reap, if now we faint not. Accordingly then, as we 10
have opportunity, let us do what is good unto all men,
but especially unto them who are of the household of
faith.

See in what large letters I have written unto you with 11

*ground of boasting, &c.] Rejoycing in
himself alone and not in an other,* AUTH., and similarly TYND., Cov., CRAN., GEN., BISH.; *haue glorie,* WICL.; *so shall he rejoice only in him-
self,* Cov. Test.; *have the glorie,* RHEM.

5. *Each]* So WICL.; *every,* AUTH. and all the remaining Vv. *Must
bear]* Shall bear, AUTH. and all the other Vv. *Load]* Charge, WICL. (and in verse 2); *burden,* AUTH. and the other Vv.

6. *But let him]* So Cov. (both); and let him, RHEM.; let him, AUTH. and the remaining Vv. *Share
with]* Comoun he with, WICL.; communicate unto, AUTH., RHEM.; minister unto, TYND., CRAN., GEN.

8. *Unto his own flesh]* To his flesh, AUTH., GEN.; in his fleisch, WICL., TYND., Cov. Test., CRAN., RHEM.; upon the fleshe, Cov. Unto the Sp.] To the spirit, AUTH. *Eter-
nal life]* Life everlasting, AUTH. and the other Vv. except WICL. and Cov. Test., which preserve the more correct order everlasting life. It is not desirable to invert the order in English except when the adjective in the original

occupies the emphatic, i.e. the first place; comp. Winer, Gr. § 59, 2, p. 464. On the translation of *αλώριος*, comp. notes on 2 Thess. i. 9 (*Transl.*).

9. *But]* And, AUTH., WICL., Cov. Test.; the rest omit δε in translation. *Let us not lose heart]* Let us not *be weary, AUTH., and so TYND., Cov., CRAN., GEN., BISH.; fail, WICL., RHEM.; fayne, Cov. Test. If now] If, AUTH., GEN., BISH.; not failyng, WICL., RHEM.; with out weriness, TYND., CRAN.; without ceas- syng, Cov.; not ceassyng, Cov. Test.

10. *Accordingly then, &c.] As we
have therefore,* AUTH.; therfor while, WICL., and similarly the remaining Vv. *What is good]* Good, AUTH. *But especially]* So RHEM.; especially, Cov.; and sim. but moost, WICL., but moost of al, Cov. Test., and specially, TYND., CRAN., GEN.; δε is omitted by AUTH., BISH., only. If by the fine idiomatic turn of the household &c. nothing more be meant than close and intimate union, it may be advantageously retained: but see notes in loc.

11. *See]* So RHEM.: se ye, WICL.;

12 mine own hand. As many as desire to make a fair show in the flesh, THEY constrain you to be circumcised ; only that they should not suffer persecution for the cross of Christ. For not even do they, who are being circumcised, themselves keep the law ; but they desire to have YOU circumcised, that they may glory in your flesh. But far be it from ME to glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ; by whom the world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world. For neither doth circumcision avail anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature. 16 And as many as walk according to this rule, peace be upon them, and mercy, and upon the Israel of God. 17 Henceforth let no man trouble me : for I bear in my body the marks of Jesus. 18 The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with your spirit, brethren. Amen.

beholde, TYND., COV. (both); ye see, AUTH., CRAN., GEN., BISH. In what, &c.] How large a letter, AUTH., TYND., CRAN., GEN., BISH.; with how many words, COV.; with what maner of letters, RHEM., and sim. WICL.; with what letters, COV. TEST.

12. *That they, &c.] Least they should, AUTH., COV. (both), CRAN.; that thei suffre not, WICL.; because they wolde not suffre, TYND., GEN.; that they may not suffer, RHEM.*

13. *Not even, &c.] Neither they themselves who are circumcised, AUTH., and similarly all the other Vv.*

The circumcision-party is far from an improbable translation; see notes. They desire] Desire, AUTH.

14. *Far be it] So WICL., COV. TEST.: God forbid that I should, AUTH.*

and the remaining Vv.

To glory] That I should glory, AUTH., BISH., RHEM.; to haue glorie, WICL.; that I shuld rejoice, TYND., COV., CRAN., GEN.; to rejoice, COV. TEST.

15. *For neither, &c.] For *in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth, AUTH.*

16. *Upon] So COV., RHEM.; unto them, COV. TEST.; shal be to them, GEN.; on, AUTH. and the remaining Vv.*

17. *Henceforth] And here aftir, WICL.; from henceforth, AUTH. and the other Vv. Of Jesus] Of *the Lord Jesus, AUTH.*

18. *The grace] Brethren, the grace, AUTH. and other Vv.: the order of the original is preserved by WICL., COV. TEST., RHEM.*

THE END.



